THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. VIII.—APRIL, 1883.—No. 30.

A LIMIT TO EVOLUTION.

ARE there, or are there not, limits to evolution? In considering this question it will be well to start with clear ideas as to what is meant by the term "evolution," for that term has various meanings.

The most familiar sense in which the word "evolution" is used may be best illustrated by such a process as the hatching of a hen's egg. The new-laid egg contains, as everybody knows, a more or less homogeneous and seemingly lifeless mass of semifluid substance (the "white" and the "yelk"), and no more. Yet, let such an egg be submitted for a time to certain definite physical conditions—such as a due supply of air, a certain amount of moisture, a certain degree of heat, etc.—and gradually that apparently passive matter takes on an organic form. After a certain formation of superficial layers, and certain foldings of a minute portion of its surface, a heart appears and beats, and blood is formed and circulates. Gradually body and limbs, with all their organs, become defined, and ultimately a living chicken, clothed with downy feathers, chips the shell, comes forth, walks about, and quickly manifests the sharpness of its senses by pecking at grains, or other small objects which it may find in its vicinity.

The hatching of eggs being an every-day matter, our very familiarity with it tends to blind our eyes to its many marvels. Really, however, the process is a very wonderful one. The more it is pondered over and studied, the more wonderful it will be seen to

be; and the most recent labors of men of science (who have lately made great advances in investigating such matters) have but added to our motives for wonder and admiration.

The process by which the egg becomes a fowl is called the "development" of the fowl, and is an example of one kind of "*evolution*"—namely, the *evolution of the individual.* Almost all living creatures, whether plants or animals, attain their adult condition by going through some essentially similar process—some process of individual evolution. The process is sometimes a very short, rapid, and uninterrupted one; sometimes it is a very long process, which appears to be interrupted at certain stages, as in the evolution of the butterfly from the egg, in which the grub and chrysalis stages of existence last long enough to seem to be interruptions in what is really a continuous series of changes.

"Evolution" should, according to its etymology, mean a process of unfolding, such as we see in the expansion of a bud, whereby its minute, closely-packed leaves, become by degrees freely expanded. But evidently no minute organs exist folded up in the glairy fluid of the new-laid egg; and microscopic examination, instead of revealing any such enfolded rudiments, actually demonstrates their non-existence.

It is none the less certain that they are not introduced from without. The gases of the atmosphere and its watery vapor find their way in through the pores of the egg-shell; but such matters, together with the physical influence of heat, are obviously quite insufficient to explain the formation of the blood, the heart, the eyes, the limbs, etc. It is evident there must be something, which no microscope, and none of our senses, however aided, can detect, present in the normal new-laid egg, which something is the real cause of the successive appearance of the different organs. This is demonstrated for us by the fact that if an unimpregnated egg, or one which has been allowed to die, be submitted to all those external processes which ordinarily suffice to hatch an egg, no chicken will, even for all that, come forth from the egg in either case.

The process of individual evolution or unfolding must, therefore, be a process of the gradual development of organs which pre-existed only in the sense that the living egg was endowed with an invisible, intangible, immaterial, *internal* force or power, capable of producing them all on the occurrence of the requisite *external* conditions.

That animals, for the most part, undergo such a process of individual evolution has long been recognized; but, till within the last few years, it has been generally supposed that each kind of animal and plant had a distinct and sudden origin, each kind being independent of every other at its first creation; now, however, the

majority of naturalists have come to believe that new species—new *kinds* of animals and plants—have from time to time arisen from antecedent kinds by a mere process of natural generation, by a process of evolution of another kind,—the *evolution of the species.* Here we find the term "evolution," and in a second and more extended sense.

Here, also, the process of "evolution" can be no "unfolding" of conditions previously enfolded. If we suppose that an antelope has been evolved from an ancestral animal having a greater likeness to existing pigs than to existing antelopes, it is evident that the antelope's horns and other special organs did not exist in a minute form in such ancestral pig. Neither could they have been introduced by changes of climate, or by any other *external* conditions. Therefore there must have been an *internal* capacity on the part of such ancestral animals to vary and develop in the way they have developed.

Some persons contend that each animal has no special and definite aptitudes of the kind, but that variation is quite unlimited (though very minute) in every organ in every direction. Others contend that there are in each case definite internal tendencies to vary in certain directions; and that there are also very definite limits, few or many, to this process of specific evolution.

This term, "evolution," is also frequently used in a third and much more extended sense. Some persons believe that the whole material universe of solar and planetary systems, has been "evolved" from one universally diffused primary mass of nebular substance—suns, moons, and worlds—crystallization, life, sentiency, and intellect having been successively evolved from the cloud-land of primeval, nebular matter, as the limbs and other organs of the chicken have been evolved from the matter of the new-laid egg.

It is not intended to discuss in the present article either this last or cosmical, evolution, or the evolution of the individual, but only that second kind of evolution, the evolution of new species, which the late Mr. Darwin's publications have made a subject of popular interest.

Neither will the question as to the truth of the belief as to specific evolution be discussed, but only the question whether (granting its truth, if only for argument's sake) there are or are not any necessary limits to the action of the evolutionary process; and if so, then what those limits may be?

It is here contended that there are and must be three such limits.

The first is a limit which stands at the beginning of all species of animals and plants considered as one great whole. This limit marks the commencement of life itself. If the world of inorganic matter, such as limestone, granite, sand, mud, water, air, etc., is, as is commonly supposed, entirely devoid of everything like life,

then it seems clear that such a world could never by itself give rise to a living being. It seems clear that the action of some other and higher agency than the properties of such substances must have been needed for the first introduction of life. On the other hand, it is possible that life may have even existed *potentially* in inorganic matter, in the sense in which "an oak" may be said to exist "potentially" in an acorn. In other words, a higher agency than mere physical force may have been implanted in matter; not life, but such antecedent conditions of subsequent life from the beginning; such higher agency producing actual life upon the concurrence of the appointed physical conditions.

Such "spontaneous generation" would not be an evolution of life from matter devoid of anything like life; nor would it be due to the action of physical forces merely. Such "spontaneous generation" has been generally in antecedent ages believed to exist, and is generally believed (amongst men of science) to have existed. Nevertheless it must be confessed that not only is all conclusive evidence for its existence wanting, but also that a mass of evidence has been of late accumulated against its present existence. That "spontaneous generation" does not now take place has become the conviction of the great majority of living scientific men,—men belonging, in other respects, to the most various schools of thought. But if such generation cannot be made to take place now, it is not easy to understand how it ever could have occurred. A vague supposition of undefined and inconceivable conditions, other than those we know, can be no explanation; and surely, if anywhere, then in physical science actual experience must be our only guide.

The second limit to evolution seems to be the limit between whatever has the power of feeling and things utterly destitute of that power. If, as is generally believed, such living things as grass, moss, trees, and other vegetable organisms, are really destitute of all power whatever of sensation, then it seems certain that no mere play of physical forces upon them could give them such a power. Once let there be some slight faculty, however rudimentary it may be, of touch, sight, or hearing, and it can be well understood how evolution may augment and perfect such rudimentary powers till we come to their more perfect state. But it is plainly impossible that the mere striking of any number of waves of sound or light, or mere impacts of any kind, upon an utterly senseless surface, can ever give to that surface a power of feeling.

The third limit of evolution is the limit which it is here contended exists between a rational nature—such as that of man—and a nature which, though rich in feelings, is devoid of reason—such as is that of the highest animals. This is the limit most interesting to us, and which it concerns us most to know. The question of

our true place in nature is one which carries with it very far-reaching consequences.

The Darwinian school teaches that man descended from ancestors allied to apes, and that from such creatures he has been gradually evolved. Now it is obviously impossible for us directly to examine man as he was in prehistoric ages. We can only infer the past from what we find about us in the present. In order, then, to form an opinion worth anything about what man *was*, we must begin by correctly understanding what man *is*. We must understand the nature and extent of his present faculties.

Ever since the time of Aristotle man has been defined as a "rational animal." That he is an animal, and endowed with the powers common to the higher animals generally, is what no one can for an instant deny. Neither can it be denied that man possesses a rationality which, however arising, and whether it is or is not different in kind and origin from instinct, is here and now distinguishably different from the powers of non-human animals.

It will be well, then, to begin this investigation by examining (1) some of those powers which we undoubtedly share with animals, and (2) also certain of our higher powers, in order that we may see whether they are or are not different in kind from the former. This examination can, of course, only be carried on by each of us looking into his own mind, and seeing what takes place, or must have taken place therein.

Now it is evident, to start with, that we possess a power of *feeling* (*i. e.*, that we possess sensitivity), and that we have many feelings of different sorts.

Thus we all have *appetites* and *desires*, with feelings of *pleasure* and *pain*. These feelings can exist independently of the human intellect, though that intellect can, by reflection, recognize their existence. That they have this independence is proved by the circumstance that even idiots and new-born babes possess them. We neither need intellect in order to feel hungry nor to make a hearty meal.

We also, of course, possess the power of experiencing feelings of certain definite kinds called *special sensations*. These definite feelings are, for example, the feeling of some color, or of some musical tone, or of bitterness, or of some pleasant or disagreeable odor, or of smoothness, or of warmth.

Again, feelings which have been experienced may again be reproduced by what we call *imagination*. "Imaginations" (or "phantasms" as they were called of old) are faint reproductions of before-felt sensations, and we cannot doubt but some, at least, of those parts of the nervous system which are strongly stimulated in experiencing an actual sensation, are also faintly (or it may be strongly) excited during the imagination of such sensation.

Thus we have manifestly a certain power of *retention* with respect to feelings, and this retentive faculty lies at the base of our wonderful power of memory. By the term "memory," as here used, that higher kind of memory, by the aid of which we may successfully seek to recall the past, is not referred to; neither is that by which a for-a-time-forgotten fact flashes forth into consciousness; but only that lower *sensuous memory*, by the help of which we perform, unconsciously, a multitude of familiar actions. Such actions may not only be performed without the advertence of our conscious intelligence, but such advertence may actually mar the performance of the action. We may find this to be the case in running up stairs, for the direction of the attention to the movements of our limbs in so doing will often create a difficulty in the accurate and easy performance of this familiar act, which would otherwise not trouble us. Again, almost every one who plays the piano by heart, knows how a melody once learned, but for the moment partly forgotten, can be best recalled by studiously turning the mind away from what is being done while an effort is made to play it automatically. In other words, the melody is recalled by avoiding the use of intellectual memory, and by trusting entirely to that sensuous memory, which has become, as it were, imbedded in the nerves and muscles,—the retentive memory of the imagination.

We have also (and it is very important to note this) a power of *associating* together feelings and imaginations in groups, and in groups of groups, so that when one or more of the feelings associated in the imagination is again freshly experienced, all the feelings which have been associated with it in the past, tend to be aroused also. Examples of the exercise of this power may occur very frequently. Thus the sound of a dinner-bell, or the sight of an expanded umbrella, may instantly arouse associated images in our minds of food or of rain. It is not only that we intellectually know that this bell may be a call to dinner, or that the umbrella is probably expanded on account of rain, but associated images may arise *before* the thoughts with which they are connected, and such images will often persist for a time in spite of our efforts to expel them. In hearing, it may be after an interval of many years, the notes of some melody familiar in early days, images may be aroused which kindle long-dormant emotions. The old man may momentarily become, in imagination, a youth once more, and seem to feel his half-paralyzed limbs again treading the rhythmical measures of the waltz, and his feeble arm supporting a form dear to memory. Even so simple a sensation as that of some odor will often recall a whole train of vivid images which have been therewith associated. These complex associations of feelings, accompanied with more or

less pleasure or pain, constitute what we may distinguish as *sensuous emotions.*

And this consideration leads naturally to the distinct recognition of a tendency which is deeply rooted in our constitution. We not only have pleasurable and painful sensations, imaginations, and emotions, but we have an innate, twofold tendency in their regard. On the one hand, this spontaneous tendency inclines us to *pursue, persist in,* or *plunge deeper into* whatever is pleasurable, and on the other to *avoid whatever is painful.*

Amongst our various feelings there are two which are of constant occurrence and have great significance. Whenever we act we have a certain vague feeling of our *self-activity,* and when we are acted on a feeling of *passivity.* These feelings are quite apart from the intellectual consciousness we have of our existence, and of the action of bodies on us. We may be walking, so deeply immersed in thought as to be quite unconscious of our movements. Let this be the case, and let the wind (blowing in the same direction as that in which we are walking) so increase as to accelerate our progression by its force. We then immediately have a feeling corresponding with our being acted on by a power external to us; a feeling different from that which corresponded with our activity acting alone and without the external propulsion. Thus, it is plain that we have not only a feeling of our activity, and of our passivity, but also a feeling corresponding with the difference between these states, apart from our intellectual recognition of the difference. So, again, in feeling one hand with the other, we have a double feeling of self-activity, and a double feeling of resistance and passivity, and in each hand we have combined feelings of both activity and passivity, and the passivity of the one is felt in correspondence with the self-activity of the other. If from this we pass to the consideration of the feelings accompanying the action of drawing our hand over a foreign body, or of grasping that body, we have again the combined feelings of activity and passivity in the hand, but its feeling of passivity is no longer felt in correspondence with any feeling of self-activity in that which occasions its feeling of passivity. Thus we come to have a feeling of the action on us of something external to us, and a practical *sensuous feeling of objects* without any intellectual recognition of their being objects.

We may next note certain feelings which occur in connection with such felt objects. In feeling something in motion (as in feeling the links of a chain drawn across the hand), we have a feeling corresponding with the *succession* of the parts as they pass, and a feeling of the *termination of the succession,* when the motion has come to an end. It is the same in hearing a succession of sounds, or seeing a series of similar objects in a line, and if there is a physical resemblance between the series of succeeding things, there is

a corresponding resemblance between the feelings they induce, which may be themselves successive. We have no feeling of succession itself, which is a purely intellectual apprehension, but we have feelings corresponding both with succession and their termination. Similarly, in exploring any solid object with the hands. We have the intellectual perception of its three dimensions of length, breadth, and thickness, but we also have a number of feelings of touch, pressure, the motion of our hand and fingers, etc., and thus we have a group of feelings, corresponding with the *extension* of the object felt, together with feelings corresponding with its limits, or the felt *terms of its extension* in different directions. In this way we come to have certain plexuses or groups of feelings corresponding with the *shapes* of bodies, and also (as by the need of more or less widely extending our arms or fingers to embrace them, or of moving our head or eyes to survey them), others corresponding with the *magnitude* of bodies. We also have feelings corresponding with the *unity* or *multiplicity* of bodies, when we are impressed by single objects, or by many, as in a sharp hailstorm.

The feelings accompanying the drawing of a chain over the hand are feelings of succession, but these are accompanied by a feeling of its *motion*, as we feel the succession of its points of contact over the breadth of the hand, and a very distinct difference of feeling takes place when this motion is brought to an end, while the chain is still felt in the grasp. We thus experience a feeling corresponding with its *rest*, as distinguished from that corresponding with its motion.

Again, we experience a certain feeling of *shock* when upon the occurrence of certain sensations, other sensations, different from those which have become associated with the former, come unexpectedly upon us. Let us suppose that an orange has been so artfully imitated as not only to look like, but to feel like an orange. Being deceived to such an extent, when we cut it open and find its interior very different from what we imagined, we have, of course, our intellectual perception of the fact, but we also have a certain feeling of shock accompanying our surprise on making the discovery. Similarly if the nature of an object seems to us doubtful, we may have a feeling of *suspended* action, and if we find out that it is in truth what we anticipated it to be, we have on the instant of finding this out a feeling, as it were, of *smooth and easy transition.* These feelings we may distinguish as corresponding with the *congruity* or *incongruity* which may exist between different modifications of our sensitivity.

By the exercise and combination of all these different kinds of feelings—by the association of sensations, imaginations, feelings of pleasure and pain, feelings of activity and passivity, and feelings corresponding with the succession, extension, figure, magnitude,

unity, multiplicity, motion and rest of bodies, we come to possess groups of feelings of the most varied kinds, which feelings correspond with different states of a multitude of external objects which have given rise to them.

The power and habit of association amongst feelings which we have thus recognized leads to yet another consequence worthy of note; when a group of sensations has become intimately associated with certain other sensations, then, upon the recurrence of these other sensations, an imagination of the sensations previously associated therewith spontaneously arises in the mind, and we have an expectant feeling of their proximate actual recurrence. Thus, the sensation of a vivid flash of lightning has come, by association, to lead to an expectant feeling of the thunder-clap to follow, and the sight of what looks like an orange, may lead, in a thirsty man, to an expectant feeling of sweet juiciness, quite apart from an intellectual recognition of the properties of an orange, or of the relation between lightning and thunder. This expectant imagination of sensations yet to come, brought about by the rousing of certain feelings, has a certain analogy with reasoning or inference, although altogether distinct from it essentially. We may, then, distinguish this kind of feeling as *sensuous inference.*

Having now reviewed these various kinds of feeling, let us next consider certain different sets of movements variously related to these feelings.

Sensuous emotions have been shortly described, but such emotions often give rise in us to movements of which we may be entirely unaware, or, if aware, quite unable to suppress, and which movements thus become *external signs* of the internal feelings (emotions) which give rise to them. Thus the emotion of terror shows itself by tremblings of lip and limb, a dropping of the jaw, suppressed breathing, and deadly pallor of the face, with staring eyes.

With the emotion of anger, the eyes glare, the hands are often clenched and raised, and the lips may be compressed or possibly drawn aside in a fierce grin.

Such signs are readily understood by those who behold them, and in this way it is plain that we possess an *emotional language*, one which merely expresses our feelings, in addition to that power of speech by which we communicate our ideas. Moreover, this emotional language of gesture, is not only understood by observers, but often by sympathy produces in them emotions like those the signs of which their senses recognize. Closely connected with and underlying this power of *sympathetically generating like emotions*, is that tendency to imitation which we all of us possess more or less, and to which reference will be shortly made.

But the complex and intimate relations which commonly exist between our feelings and movements of all kinds, are surprising. Thus even the trivial act of a lad throwing a stone at a mark, is very wonderful when we come to examine it carefully. How complex must be the co-ordinations between different parts of the body in order to produce the result! The lad's mind has little to do with it beyond the one impulse to hit the mark. He knows nothing of anatomy, but sets going the wonderful mechanism of his body (with all the diverse and delicate feelings of its different parts), and this works out the desired effect for him as if it were only an elaborate piece of mechanism. In the first place, the various parts of his eyes must be adjusted to see the object distinctly. Then his body must be held in a certain position, the stone be grasped with a certain strength, the arm be thrown back to the due extent, and its muscles contracted in co-ordination with his sense of sight, and with just that degree of vigor, as his fingers are relaxed, which will carry the stone as desired. Different feelings accompany these actions—feelings of activity, passivity, etc.,—and these feelings guide the actions of his body as a sort of automatic sensitive machine.

That these co-ordinated actions may take place through the intervention of merely sensuous impulses, is plain, from the fact that many idiots and sleep-walkers perform them. Even with regard to ourselves, we may set going our bodily mechanism in a certain way and then withdrawing our mind entirely from its actions leave it to act, as it were, by itself. Thus we often start for a certain place and then give up our thoughts entirely to some engrossing matter, walking on "lost in thought" till we are surprised at suddenly finding we have arrived at, or possibly overshot, our destination, without having thought at all about our journey while on the road. But the remarkable power we have of co-ordinating complex series of actions and sensations is exceedingly well shown in such an action as playing the piano by heart. Here the actions follow each other in an orderly series in connection with felt touches of the keys and heard sounds of the notes. Let a key stick or a note become dumb, and the automatic action ceases—through a failure of co-ordination in the associated sensations—and intellectual attention is at once aroused.

The result of all the foregoing powers of feeling, with their associations, and of all the foregoing powers of motion, with their various co-ordinations, is that we have the power of *uniting or synthesizing our various pleasurable tendencies* into now one and now another *dominant impulse*, and of *synthesizing our various co-ordinated motions* so as to unite them into *one complex, general* action directed *to gratify such dominant impulse.*

Let us now consider that tendency to, and power of, *imitation*, which was spoken of a little way back. Of course we may intentionally imitate, but this is not at all the one of action which is here referred to. Everyone knows how frequently yawning is induced in many persons by the sight of another person yawning. Such spontaneous and unintentional imitation is often carried much further, notably by certain idiots, who accurately imitate any actions which may be performed before them. This tendency is at first very surprising. When, however, we reflect that the sight of any movement tends slightly to stimulate those very nerves in the observer which correspond with those by which the action observed has been produced, it becomes easily explicable. For, let the stimulation be sufficiently augmented, and actual movement on the part of the observer necessarily follows.

Lastly, we have, through the action of associated feelings and co-ordinated motions, the power spontaneously and automatically to employ what are practically means to an end, apart from our intellectual recognition of either "means" or "end" as being "means" or "end." This is brought about mainly by the association of feelings, but partly by our innate tendency to imitation. It is by the habitual association of feelings that, without a moment's thought, we take the simplest means to obtain ends, such as to quicken our pace to overtake a friend we may discover to be walking in front of us, or to jump upon a bank to pluck a flower which otherwise is above our reach. The sight of some simple means employed by their seniors, may lead to children, by imitation and without reflection, employing the same means themselves, which may readily become automatically habitual if the result attained is agreeable and capable of frequent repetition. The employment of means for ends apart from the exercise of the intellect is sometimes exhibited by somnambulists. Thus a sleep-walker will open a drawer to take out of it some desired object therein contained, or will turn a key to unlock a door, and so obtain entrance into some locality sought after. Such actions are easily explicable through the habitual associations of sensations with co-ordinated movements. Thus the senses of the sleep-walker have presented to them various groups of sensations, such as those produced by the walls and furniture of the room the somnambulist is traversing on his way to the desired locality, the entrance to which is locked. The sensations thus induced arouse the imagination of the inside of the desired locality; this arouses the nervous channels habitually stimulated in overcoming the intervening obstruction, the hand automatically seeks the key, the stimulus of its touch stimulates the muscles of the arm, the key is turned, and the door opened. Very complex movements of the kind are sometimes

performed in order to *complete a harmony which the imagination craves.*

Let a certain set of initial sensations (*A*, *B*, *C*) have been habitually followed in past experience by certain other sensations (*L*, *M*, *N*), which latter are intimately connected with certain movements (λ, μ, ν). Thus upon the actual recurrence of the sensations *A*, *B*, *C*, the imagination of the associated sensations *L*, *M*, *N*, may give rise to such a craving anticipation of their repetition that the requisite movements λ, μ, ν, will be performed automatically so as to bring about their recurrence, and so complete the sensational harmony vaguely desired. This is the practical imagination of means to an end without the intellectual recognition of either end or means.

Such are some of the many and wonderful powers of feeling with which human nature is endowed.

It will be well now to consider the intellectual side of our nature.

We all know that we have perceptions of things about us. But what *is* a perception? Selecting some familiar object as an example—say a white handkerchief—how do we perceive it? Through a number of impressions it makes on our organs of sense, such as: the feeling of a certain softness and pliability; of a certain smoothness, a certain kind of whiteness, etc., with various other feelings which were before described as culminating in what has been here distinguished as "sense-perception." But though these feelings exist, it is not these nor any feelings resulting from them which we perceive in our act of perception, but *through* them we have the apprehension of a distinct object,—*the handkerchief itself*. The feelings it produces in us are the *means* of our perception, but not the *object* of perception. So with every other external object we may look at, the sensations and other feelings they occasion in us are not adverted to by us. They are signs of the object, which signs seem themselves to disappear in making known the object they introduce to our notice, though they really persist unnoticed. It is plain that they do persist, since we can actually observe them persisting if we choose to advert to them. Thus, if we are looking, for example, at a house, we can observe if we please any of the sense-impressions which are actually affording us the perception of that house. We can observe the shape of the image made by it on our field of vision, and we can draw out on paper the perspective lines of the building, but when we look at a house ordinarily, we do not perceive *them* but *it*.

If a solid cube, suspended by a string, be turned round in front of us, we can never see the whole of it at once, and its faces, as we see them in perspective, do not appear square but lozenge-

shaped. Nevertheless these, in themselves imperfect sensible signs, serve perfectly well to give us not a feeling, but a true and adequate perception of the whole cube as it is in itself. It is true and noteworthy also that the very act of turning the cube round, and so changing our successive sensations, causes no corresponding changes in our perception of the cube, which remains throughout the same, or even becomes more clearly and definitely a single perception of a single object, through the multiplicity and variety of the succeeding sensations it occasions. Perception, then, is a natural interpretation of sensible signs—an interpretation made spontaneously, unconsciously, and without advertence by a natural power which our intelligence possesses, and which is improved by practice.

But into *what* does this natural power interpret the signs given to our sense organs by external objects? Into the apprehension of something distinct from and independent of us; into the apprehension of some object which, as standing opposite, as it were, to each of us, who may be the subject of the sensations we call *objective*, while all modifications or affections of the thinking and feeling subject of such sensations we call *subjective*.

In every perception, then, we perceive an object of some kind. It may be that we know it as a horse; or merely as a quadruped; or if not that, then as a living creature; or, perhaps, only as some solid body; and if we cannot be sure even of that, then, at least, we perceive it to be *something*.

"Something!" what a wonderful idea is enshrined in that most familiar expression! It is the idea of *Existence*, the idea of *Being*, and this supreme notion rises spontaneously to the lips of the little child who asks, "What is that *thing*, mother?"

"Being," is an idea which is inexplicable, for no one can even ask what "being," or "existence" is or means, without showing, by his very question, that he himself already both possesses, and (to a certain extent, at least) understands it.

"Existence," or "being," is an idea applicable to everything which can be conceived by the human mind as having any reality. The other much more restricted classes of objects just referred to—"solid body," "living creature," "quadruped," "horse"—which we supposed to have been perceived in the supposed act of perception, are all ideas which are applicable (though in a vastly less degree than the idea "something") to a greater or less number of distinct things. Each of these conceptions, for example, that of "horse," is applicable to a multitude of individuals of the same kind—to all horses. At the same time such a conception considered *in itself* is ONE. It is a *single* notion, not of any one subsisting thing, but of a kind or class of things real or possible. It refers to a whole

group of such things to each one of which the notion is applicable. It is, therefore, a *general* or *universal* idea.

It will be well now to advert to, that we may distinctly recognize it, that extreme contrast—that difference of kind—which exists between this intellectual conception on the one hand, and all those varieties of feelings and groups of feelings which we have, and to which attention has here been called as they have been successively passed in review.

"Feelings," whether single or in groups of groups, are all modifications of the sentient being which is the subject of them. They are impressions on our sensitivity made by individual things never felt as otherwise than individual. They are, therefore, essentially individual and subjective, while our intellectual perceptions are essentially universal and objective.[1] "Sense perceptions" are groups of associated feelings, but "ideas" are apprehensions of objective qualities grouped round an objective unity about which various judgments may be affirmed. The former are but reinstatements of sense, the latter are unities abstracted from sense. Feelings again can never be reflective. There is, indeed, a feeling of self-activity but not of any definite feeling or being of whatever kind it may be. It is quite otherwise with an idea which may be perceived and recognized as being the sort of idea it is.

In all those states of our unconscious activity—habitual actions, sleep-walking, etc.,—which have been before referred to, there is no intellectual recognition of external objects as objective. Each excites its own impressions, which produce corresponding appropriate actions, and similar causes produce in us, of course, similar effects. But the mind in this condition, in spite of its effective action, does not apprehend that the objects thus practically recognized by our organism as alike, belong to one kind or class of existences.

This essential distinctness will be more clearly apparent if we refer again to our conception of "existence" or "being." That notion is applicable, as I have said, to everything, and, therefore, both to the subject thinking and to the object he thinks about, both of these being and being clearly seen to be "beings" of different kinds. Without this idea, nothing can be understood or apprehended.

But no sensation or group of feelings, however complex, could

[1] As Mr. Lewes has truly said (Problems of Life and Mind, 3d series, p. 467): "No aggregation of mathematical lines can make a mathematical surface, for lines are without breadth. No aggregation of images will make an idea, for images are particular and of concrete objects, whereas ideas are general and abstracted from the concrete by a special operation. It is true we cannot imagine a line without breadth, nor a general object without particular qualities, but we can and do think these, and this mode of thinking is ideation or conception."

give us a *feeling* of "being;" because, though there is a feeling of "self-activity," and a feeling of "passivity," and of the actions of external things upon us, there neither is nor can be any feeling common to these and all other feelings, and yet, if there was a feeling of "being" at all, it must be of this universality of nature, while at the same time it must be a distinguishable feeling of some kind. Yet, though we have no *feeling* of "being," the *idea* of "being" lies at the very root of all our conceptions, and, as I have said, presents itself spontaneously to the mind even of the infant.

It is nevertheless quite true that we cannot have any of the ideas or notions which either perception or reflection give us, without first having corresponding sense-impressions (sense-perceptions) or imaginations, as their basis and support. This necessity is a simple fact of observation, and may be seen to be a consequence of our bodily organization. Our minds are first aroused to activity by the action of surrounding bodies upon our sensitivity, and can never at any time act without some imagination—some phantasm—accompanying, and, as it were, supporting that action.

Thus in every intellectual perception we have two distinct elements: (1) We have first, what may be called the subjective element,—the feelings, or sensible signs, aroused by the presence of the object; and we have (2) secondly, what may be called the objective element,—our intellectual apprehension of the object as it really exists in itself apart from our sensations. In this latter objective element we may distinguish two distinct aspects and notions: one is (1) that of the *nature* of the thing perceived, and the other is (2) the actual *subsistence* of that thing.

But the distinctness of kind which exists between the sensitive and the intellectual sides of our nature will be yet more apparent if we go one step further in the examination of our higher faculties. We have examined perception, and seen that it is the translation of a multitude of feelings into a single intellectual idea or notion of some being or other, and this of course implies a sort of vague mental operation that the thing perceived is of that kind. It contains, therefore, our implicit judgment. The one step further, beyond perception, is the clear and explicit mental operation that the thing really is of that kind we perceive it to be. This latter act is a mental affirmation or *judgment*—an act which follows upon and is the consequence of antecedent perceptions.

What, then, does our mind do in forming an explicit judgment? Every object which presents itself to our senses possesses a number of different qualities, such as shape, size, color, etc., which are more or less distinctly perceived by us simultaneously, and in union with our perception of the object possessing them. But, the act by which we perceive them is different from that by which we per-

ceive the object as one whole. Perception is the acquisition of one idea through a multitude of sensations; but an explicit judgment involves, first, the ideal separation, and then the ideal union of the qualities of the object about which we judge. What is this power which thus ideally separates these qualities? It is the power of ABSTRACTION.

By the act of abstraction our mind isolates (in order to consider them distinctly) those various ideal qualities of an object which were not distinctly noticed in our first perception of the object.

No sooner has any object, such, for example, as an oak tree, been perceived by us as a distinct subsisting reality, than it undergoes this singular transformation. The various qualities which, in truth, exist intimately united in that concrete, real oak tree, are ideally detached and isolated from it in our minds, and regarded in themselves. Thus, in the initial stage of a judgment, such as, "*that is an oak*," its various qualities, such as "solidity," "branching shape," "vegetable nature," etc., are abstracted by our minds, and thus the abstract idea, "an oak," is distinctly apprehended by the help of a number of subordinate abstract ideas. For what are the various qualities of any object—its shape, size, color, etc.? They are, in reality, so many states or conditions of one actual, really-subsisting, material thing. But they also have an ideal existence, as so many abstract ideas, in the mind which apprehends them.

Let us for a moment consider the "branching shape" of the oak, as it exists in reality, before abstraction, and as it exists ideally after abstraction.

Really, and before abstraction, it is one of the aspects of *that particular oak tree*, a quality actually united indissolubly with it, and not existing at all save in that one particular oak tree. After abstraction, it is no longer one aspect of that oak, but is a general conception, an idea, applicable not only to all oaks, but to all branching things.

One fundamental abstraction is that which was for a moment before referred to, namely, the abstraction of the nature—the "thatness," so to speak—of a thing, for its existence is subsistence. When we say, "that is an oak," we do not mean to assert that a *kind* exists, but that there is a *real* thing *of a certain kind*.

This process of mental abstraction is a necessary result of our nature. In the presence of any object apprehended by us, it is actually impossible for us not to apprehend some or other of its qualities.

As soon as we use our reason, as soon as we ask ourselves what anything is, and try to have any clear and distinct notion about it,

we are compelled to thus ideally separate its qualities by abstraction.

But we cannot, by mere abstraction, form any judgment. In order to do that, there must be a second and reverse process,—a putting ideally together again what has just been ideally separated.

For the mind (which being conscious knows what it does) when it has analyzed the perceived oak into its ideal elements, immediately recognizes the real unity and concrete identity (which, indeed, it has never lost sight of) between the qualities it has ideally abstracted and the object (the actually subsisting oak), whence it has abstracted them. It is the expression of this perception of unity, following on abstraction, which is the judgment, and judgment completes by vision, a synthesis, a process which it began by separation or analysis.

The intellect, by its judgment, "that is an oak," declares that its abstraction has only been ideal, and that the elements which it has ideally separated exist, in fact, united in the really subsisting concrete oak tree.

Thus, for every judgment, expressing even the very simplest affirmation, three intellectual acts are necessary: (1) A perception; (2) a mental analysis, by abstraction, of the object perceived; and, (3) an ideal synthesis of these abstractions with the object. Now the most elementary acts of the human intelligence are judgments. The human intellect, therefore, is essentially a uniting and dividing power, an active principle, proceeding by analysis and synthesis.

This complicated process is necessary, because, in order that we may understand any object it needs to be, as it were, first digested by our mind, in order that it may be assimilated, just as our bodily food cannot be assimilated without first being digested. It is "abstraction" which plays the part of a mental gastric juice, and ideally separates the qualities of every object, and so makes them clear and luminous to us. One can see at a glance how much better such qualities as "solidity," "branching shape," etc., can be apprehended, after they have been thus distinctly noted by abstraction, than when they were first confusedly perceived in the primitive act of perception.

This process, which it takes so long to describe, is performed by the mind with unimaginable rapidity. It is all done while we are saying, "*That is an oak.*"

That we should do all this without being aware of it may seem strange. But how many persons speak, like M. Jourdain, without thinking about or knowing the movements which they have to perform to give utterance to their words!

It may be well here to say a few words to guard against a by

no means impossible error. In perception a variety of elements are united into the conception of a distinct object. In abstraction an object is analyzed into a variety of elements. It might, then, be supposed that the elements into which abstraction dissolves a notion are the very same elements from which it was constructed in the original perception. In other words, it might possibly be supposed that abstraction was some sort of return towards the condition existing the moment before perception. But this would be a great mistake. The *elements which minister to perception* are sensible elements, sensations and imaginations. They are affections of our sensitivity and modifications of our organs of sense. They are essentially individual and subjective. The *elements which are separated by abstraction* are ideal elements, they are abstract general ideas, and are essentially universal and objective.

Moreover, in many instances, the abstract ideas by no means correspond with the sensible signs. Thus, for example, the one abstract idea "motion" may be apprehended through a number of very different sensible signs, such as: (1) By the travelling of the image of an object over our field of vision; (2) by a feeling of anything slipping over the skin; (3) by the muscular feelings and feelings of tension in our eyeballs as we follow with our eyes an object in motion; (4) by sensations of touch which we may receive from a moving object while we grasp it, etc. Yet the resulting idea, "motion," is one and the same idea, however differently it may be called forth. But not only may a multitude of different sensible signs minister to one and the same idea, but also one and the same set of sensible signs may minister to a variety of very different ideas. Thus, the sight of a photograph of the Queen may give rise: (1) to the idea of her Majesty herself; (2) to the idea of royal rank; (3) to the idea of a woman; (4) to the idea of a human being; (5) to the idea of likeness; (6) to the idea of chemical action; (7) to the idea of the sun's actinic power; (8) to the idea of the effect of light and shade; (9) to the idea of the substance paper; (10) to the idea of an inanimate object; and so on, till we come at last to the idea of something, *i. e.*, the idea of being or existence. This radical distinctness between feeling and thought is further shown by the circumstances that the former may be impaired or paralyzed by the very excess of the action of its own faculty, while the latter cannot be so impaired. A dazzling light or a deafening sound may make sensation impossible, but it is impossible for ideas to be too distinct and vivid.

What is the bearing of all these facts and considerations upon the doctrine of evolution? It has a very important bearing on the possibility or impossibility of the evolution of man from the lower animals.

There is one plain and obvious difference between men and all brutes, for men speak, while animals are dumb.

It may be naturally objected, however, by some readers of this paper, that there are such things as dumb men, and that many animals are eloquent with a language of their own. The songs and calls of birds have meanings which are practically understood by their fellows. Some dogs will make certain facts known to their masters by their voice, just as other dogs (pointers and setters) will make known other facts by their gestures; while parrots and jackdaws will learn actually to speak whole sentences.

All this is very true, but it is nothing to the point. As to mutes, that a structural defect should hinder a man from speaking, no more proves that man is not essentially a speaking animal than the fact that a man cannot talk when he is gagged. Moreover, even mutes commonly possess a truly intellectual language of gesture. As to animals, no reasonable person can doubt the expressiveness of their language; but it is fundamentally different in kind from human language. In order to see this clearly, however, it is necessary distinctly to understand what we do when we speak.

Let us suppose a man and a brute to be both standing under an oak tree which begins to fall. The falling tree will produce similar effects on the senses of both. Both will instinctively fly from the danger. Both may utter an inarticulate cry of alarm; and both, by their cries and gestures, may give rise to similar feelings of alarm in other men and brutes. Such language, whether vocal or of gesture, is that emotional language which has already been described as one of our own lower, unintellectual powers, and this power is fully possessed by animals also.

The man, however, may do what the brute cannot do; he may emit vocal sounds: "That oak is falling!"

What is the nature of these sounds?

The words are the embodiment and expression, not of *feelings* of any kind, but of three universal, abstract *ideas*.

(1) The word "*oak*" corresponds with the intellectual conception which has been already considered. It is a universal, common name, or an abstract term applicable, even above the particular oak which is falling, to every other actual or possible oak. It denotes no single, subsisting thing, but a kind or whole class of things.

(2) The word "*is*" denotes the most wonderful and important of all abstract ideas, that of existence or being. It is an idea which we must have in order to perform any intellectual act. It is an idea which, though not at first itself adverted to, makes all other ideas perceptible to the intellect, as light, though itself unseen, renders everything else visible to us.

(3) The word "*falling*" is a term denoting another abstraction,—an abstract quality or state.

When we see a real oak tree actually beginning to fall, we apprehend a single reality, "the oak falling." In so doing we separate, by abstraction, the idea "falling"—the idea of anything tumbling from above downwards. This idea, of course, is applicable not only to any falling oak, but to anything whatever it may be which may fall. Yet the idea itself is strictly one idea.

That these various ideas are thus spontaneously abstracted by the human mind, through the sensuous impressions made on our organism by external bodies, is demonstrated by the various differently expressed judgments to which one single fact may give rise. Thus we may say, "that oak is falling," or "that falling oak exists," or "that falling object is an oak." All these judgments are simply different modes of expressing the ideas which the mind has spontaneously abstracted from the external fact observed. A very plain and simple example of human speech has been selected, in order to show that all human language (other than emotional manifestations) necessarily implies and gives expression to a number of abstract ideas.

Abstraction, then, is as universal as language. All our words, except proper names, pronouns and certain determinating adjectives, express abstract ideas.

Expressions denoting abstract ideas, general or universal names, are spontaneously made use of by children as soon as they begin to speak; and "gee-gee," or "quack-quack," are as good and true general or universal abstract terms as are "horse" or "duck."

Children at first give terms very wide, vague meanings, which they subsequently learn to restrict.

This faculty of abstraction must, then, be possessed by every one who speaks, and (as has just been observed) it is also possessed by most human beings who cannot speak.

The difference between human, rational language, and the merely emotional language of animals and of men, does not consist in any difference as to articulation. It consists in the appropriation or non-appropriation of sounds or gestures to denote abstract ideas; above all, the idea of being, and its modifications.

Parrots articulate, but they do not thereby express ideas. Mutes cannot articulate, but by their gestures they do express ideas. The distinguished son of a friend of ours alarmed his parents when a child by the length of time he remained unable to speak. Yet all the time he showed, by an elaborate language of gesture, that he had very distinct intellectual conceptions.

At an institution in Edinburgh the Lord's Prayer is acted in an elaborate manner. The idea "Father" is expressed by an action

indicating old man; the idea "name" by touching the forehead, and indicating the action of spelling on the fingers; the idea "done" by the hands working; the conception, "on earth as it is in heaven," by two signs for "heaven" and "earth," and by putting the two forefingers side by side to express "equality," and so on.

The fulness and accuracy to which gesture language may attain is shown by the recent letters in the newspapers of deaf mutes, who object to the system of teaching the deaf and dumb to read the lips. The expressiveness of gesture language is also exhibited by the performance of plays acted entirely by gesture, and without a single spoken word,[1] and also by the performance of the Anglican church service by gesture, in the church for the deaf, in Oxford Street.

Thus it is abundantly evident that rational conceptions, "abstract ideas," can exist without spoken words, but there is no evidence that they can continue to exist without some embodiment, some form of language, some corporeal expression, either by voice or by gesture.

Language, therefore, is the consequence of thought, and abstract ideas are the indispensable preliminaries of language. We see this in our common experience. When, in the cultivation of any science or art, newly observed facts give rise to new conceptions, new terms are invented to give expression to such conceptions. New words arise as a *consequent* and not as an *antecedent* of such intellectual action. New terms are always fitted to fresh ideas, and not fresh ideas to new terms.

That language is dependent on thought, not thought on language, is demonstrated for us by the lightning-like rapidity—a rapidity far too great for words—with which our minds may detect a fallacy in an argument. This instantaneousness is not the mere mental ejaculation of the word "no," for the mental act is not a blind one, but is due to our instantly seeing the nature of the fallacy. The most rapid cry or gesture of negation is often then the sign of intellectual perceptions which would require more than one sentence fully to express, but which are perceived too rapidly for even the mental repetition of the words of such sentences.

Nevertheless these intellectual perceptions show themselves by bodily signs—sounds or gestures—and even all our silent thought is carried on by the aid of imagined actions of the mind, and without such we cannot think. The mental and bodily sides of language are so intimately united that, though the mental is anterior, it at once seeks, as it were, to incarnate itself, and, under normal

---

[1] The elaborate ballet, in several acts, entitled "La jolie fille de Gand," may be especially referred to.

conditions, does incarnate itself in corporeal expression.[1] The latter, however, gives only imperfect expression to the deeper and wider-reaching thought. It is to the fact that thought is anterior to speech, and that mental language has a greater range and perfection than its bodily expression, that the growth and development of language is due.

But if thought cannot continue to exist in us without embodiment, *a fortiori* speech cannot exist without thought and without those complex intellectual actions of abstraction and recomposition of abstract ideas which are its very life.

Every, even the simplest, judgment, then, is really of this lofty intellectual nature, and is thoroughly different in kind from plexuses and amalgamations of feelings. Thought as compared with feeling, is universal instead of singular; objective instead of subjective; abstract instead of concrete; independent of particular sense-organs, instead of dependent on particular sense-organs; independent of particular sense-impressions, instead of being tied down to particular sense-impressions; often reflective, instead of never reflective; not impaired by intensity of its faculty, instead of being possibly so impaired; capable of being associated according to logical relations, instead of being associated by contiguity; and above all instinct with the great and luminous idea of "being" or "existence;" and, lastly, related also to perceptions of unity and truth, instead of being, as feelings are, quite unrelated to such ideas.

We cannot affirm "that is an oak," without having these ideas of truth and unity. For, in saying the oak exists, we must mean that the oak is one concrete, substantial thing; that its qualities and its form are substantial, whole; that it is a thing which really exists, and that the idea of it in our minds really and truly corresponds with the oak as it exists in itself out of our minds. If it could be shown that what we take to be an oak is not really *one* thing but made up of a number of things which happen accidentally to look like an oak, or if the apparent oak turns out to be some cleverly arranged spectral illusion, then, in either case, the object does not respond to our thought, which is thus shown to have contained within it implicitly the ideas unity and truth.

[1] Dr. W. W. Ireland, in his valuable work on *Idiocy and Imbecility* (Churchill, 1877), gives (p. 276) an instance of a boy "who, although he cannot speak ordinary words, yet has invented a few of his own, to which he attaches fixed meanings. Thus he says 'weep-oo' for night and black, 'burly' for wood or for a carpenter, 'tutteras' for soldiers, 'hubbs' for big or large, and so on."

The same author (chapter xx., p. 368), goes at length into the many tales of children being fostered by wild beasts, but there is not one which proves more (nor does the author consider that more is proved) than that idiots have occasionally been found abandoned by cruel or designing parents. The wonderful case of Laura Bridgman (p. 225), who was blind as well as deaf, amounts to a demonstration of the wonderful innate intellectual capacities of the human mind.

Such being the nature even of the simplest affirmation, it is plain that all descriptions and reviewings, which are made up of various connected series of affirmations, must have a similar intellectual character, and so still more with respect to our acts of induction, deduction, intuition, or of necessary truth and perception of truth, beauty, and goodness as such.

It is, however, enough for our purpose to note the difference of kind between all our lower, merely sensitive powers, and our power of forming abstract ideas. For with this latter power all, even the lowest, are evidently endowed, since they all speak. In saying, then, that men speak while animals are dumb, what was meant was, not that men emit vocal, articulate sounds which animals do not, but that men, either by sounds or gestures, signify universal, objective, abstract ideas, which are poles asunder from all our powers of feeling. They belong to a different category, and a nature which has this power of abstraction is separated from a nature which has not this power by a necessary difference of kind. This difference, therefore, constitutes a naturally impassable *limit to evolution*, because feeling and intellect are themselves different in nature, and progress and develop along different, and, as we have seen, in some respects, diverging roads.

But not a few persons will perhaps reply by saying that certain animals are highly intelligent, and that most of the higher kinds at the least know their friends and enemies, and that dogs show the most disinterested love and affection, also gratitude, and sometimes even a feeling of shame. It may be said, therefore, that animals "know" very much what men "know," and that, though they have not *words* wherewith to express their feelings and their knowledge, they nevertheless possess the corresponding ideas.

Now it would be unjust as well as absurd to deny the admirable and lovable endowments of the animal world. That man must have a very defective nature who feels no affection for his faithful brute companion. But we must not let affection mislead us any more than hatred, and in considering the higher faculties of dogs, monkeys, elephants, and such highly endowed creatures, there are four rules which should be borne carefully in mind.

(1) The first is, not to be misled by affection or its opposite. The owners of pets are frequently tempted to read into the actions of such animals meanings for which there is no real evidence, and to mistake for observations imperfect inferences due to partiality.

(2) The second rule is, to guard against the constant tendency by which we are beset, to judge everything by our own standard, and, without reason, to imagine human qualities in things not human. This is the well-known error spoken of as anthropo-

morphism, against which we are so often warned by the enemies of all religion.

(3) The third rule is, not to suppose the existence of unknown causes, when known causes suffice to explain observed effects. This is the old well-known rule, called Occam's razor: *Entia non sunt multiplicanda præter necessitatem.*

(4) The fourth rule is, to bear in mind that if any cause, did it exist, would produce certain effects, then the absence of such effects argues the non-existence of such cause.

Now, of course, animals have intelligence, understanding, and knowledge, in the loose sense in which these terms are popularly used about them. In a sense they have "memories," "anticipations," "inferences," "a certain power of language," etc. In a way they recognize "classes of objects," seek to follow up and rest on the pleasurable and to avoid the painful, and, in a sense, "take means to attain decided ends." What is the true nature of these powers of theirs?

Of course, we cannot, while remaining men, perfectly appreciate what the mental state of an animal may be, but we can go a long way towards doing so because we are animals ourselves. Man and the higher animals have similar sense organs and similar feelings, imaginations, and emotions; and evidently a similar power exists in both of associating their feelings in groups and groups of groups, and co-ordinating actions in response to such feelings.[1] Now the author does not of a moment hesitate to affirm that there is no known action of any brute animal which cannot be fully explained by its possession of those merely sensitive powers, and the exercise of those co-ordinated actions directed to avoid pain and follow up pleasure, which we ourselves possess and exercise amongst our lower faculties, and which we know may act without the co-operation of the rational intelligence, because they so operate in our own case.

True intellectual intelligence, therefore, is not (according to our third rule) to be asserted of animals, because their actions can be explained without it by the help of that simple sensitivity, which we know, from the study of their anatomy and physiology, they do possess.

But our fourth rule absolutely compels us to deny real intelli-

[1] The late learned Professor Green, of Oxford, has observed: "We must remember that there is no reason to suppose, because the burnt dog shuns the fire, that he perceives any relation between it and the pain of being burnt. A sequence of one feeling upon another is but a consciousness of relation between them, much less of relation between facts which they represent. The dog's conduct may be accounted for by the simple sequence of an imagination of pain upon a visual sensation, resembling one which actual pain has previously followed. . . . . Till dogs can talk, what data have we on which to found another explanation?"

gence to brutes. For if animals had capacities similar to our higher mental powers, they would quickly make us unmistakably aware that such was the case. In order to do this they need not speak. It would be quite enough if they showed us by a language of gesture—similar to that used by the deaf and dumb in reciting the Lord's Prayer, or to that used in certain ballets—that they really conceived abstract ideas. The absence of any such unequivocal sign, in spite of the many needs and the many exciting causes likely to elicit it, eloquently proclaims their essentially unintellectual condition.

To the assertion, then, that the distinction between men and animals is a difference in the external signs of their internal states, we reply, "That, indeed, is just it!" The difference in the *signs* corresponds with an essential internal difference of kind in the things *signified*. If animals *had* ideas, such ideas would be sure to clothe themselves in the language of gesture, if not in speech. Bodily signs are necessary for the mental activity of even the very highest human intelligence; certainly, then, they would also be necessary for intelligence of a lower kind, did such exist.

Thus the so-called "intelligence, understanding, and knowledge" of animals are not really true intelligence, understanding, and knowledge. They are but sensuous simulations of such intellectual faculties.

The distinctness of the human mind from brute intelligence will be clearly seen if we consider our own perceptions of the *qualities* of objects. A dog may feel fear of another dog which is strong and courageous, but it will have no idea of "courage" or "courageousness" in the abstract. Many animals, even insects, will distinguish clearly between objects differently colored—the white from the blue, and the red from the yellow—but no animal knows "whiteness" or "blueness," and still less does he know the higher abstraction, "color." Yet every savage who rewards a youth of his tribe for an act of courage, or who smears his body with pigments, shows that these abstract ideas are familiar to him. In a word, no animal knows "kinds" or "classes," or "properties," or "qualities," *as such*, but all these are known to every sane human being.

A yet more striking distinction is afforded by that special quality or property we denominate "goodness." To see the meaning of the word "good," let us consider some simple sentence in which it is employed, *e.g.*, such as "gratitude is a good thing." What does the word here mean? Gratitude certainly gives pleasure, promotes happiness, and conduces to prosperity. But our idea of "goodness" is something essentially different from the ideas, "pleasure," "happiness," and "prosperity." The idea of a being

who sacrifices all these excellent things in order to perform what he deems an act of duty, is the idea of a very good being, but not necessarily of a happy one. The idea of "goodness" is generally accompanied by a feeling of complacency, but it needs not be so. Moral feeling is a sort of *rational instinct*, and its existence is necessary to prove a perfect man; but moral truth may be at the same time both clearly perceived and *hated*. Moreover, the goodness of men's actions is estimated, as far as possible, not by their results, but by their *motives*.

But the radical distinctness of the idea of goodness from every other conception may be shown by any analysis of precepts we may choose to make. Let us suppose, for example, that any one is told "he should pay his tailor," and the truth of the saying is disputed; how should we set about trying to convince him of its truth? Obviously, by putting forward some more elementary and general moral precept, which we anticipate will be assented to at once; as that "every man is bound to pay his just debts." And if this is again disputed, we might say, "A man is bound to satisfy obligations he has voluntarily incurred," and so on. In each step of such explanation there must be some declaration as to duty, until we come to some assertion of the kind the truth of which is admitted at once as self-evident. As Mr. Arthur Balfour has said, "*The general propositions which really lie at the root of any ethical system must themselves be ethical.*" In other words, we cannot prove any truths concerning duty by appealing to considerations into which the idea of duty does not enter. Since, then, every inculcation of duty depends, if not self-evident, upon some anterior and more fundamental ethical precept, it is clear that no such perception could ever have been evolved from beings devoid of such perceptions, and incapable of emitting any ethical judgment whatever, as all brute animals are. A power of ethical perception could evidently never have been evolved from any creature which, however it may be affected by feelings of affection, timidity, or even shame, was unable to apprehend self-evident ethical judgments of any kind whatever.

The human mind, and the human mind only, has the power of making an abstract quality a distinct object of thought and of holding that abstraction up opposite the mind for examination.

Thus a most distinct and broad limit, a difference not of degree but of kind, divides men from all, even the highest brutes. There is a limit to evolution between human and merely animal nature, and something altogether new to this planet—a new departure—must have taken place with the first coming of man upon it.

It is this consequence which makes many persons so unwilling to admit the truth of such a distinction of kind, for they feel they

cannot imagine any such origin of man. And of course they cannot imagine it because no one can imagine anything of which he has had no sort of previous experience, and we certainly have never had actual experience of any such new departure. But our inability to *imagine* it is no ground whatever for our not *believing* it, if reason gives us good evidence in its favor. We continually and very reasonably form convictions about things we are quite unable to imagine. Thus no one can imagine his own power or act of sight, or the validity of the argument he logically deduces from true premises, but he would not be exceptionally acute, but exceptionally foolish, if on that account he doubted about such things.

But the essence of humanity is human reason acting as has been here described. Its essence is not man's bodily shape, which is undoubtedly that of a sort of ape. If Swift's tale about the Houyhnhnms and Yahoos was true, it would be horse-shaped Houyhnhnms who would be the true men and the man-shaped Yahoos the real brutes.

We have never seen the origin of any new species, and we cannot therefore imagine the origin of man. But it does not follow that had we witnessed his origin we should have been conscious of any interruption of the orderly course of nature. We should have been aware of a new phenomenon, but not necessarily of anything whatever miraculous. If the twin progeny of some ape-like animal, more human than any the remains of which have yet been found, had infused into it the idea of "being," the power of perceiving objects as of certain classes and of recognizing their qualities, such creatures (though as yet unable to articulate, and only able in the most rudimentary way to give intelligent bodily expression to their incipient ideas) would be at once truly and essentially human.

Those persons, then, are very foolish who refuse to recognize the distinctness of kind which exists between men and brutes through fear that by such recognition they should be committed to certain theological doctrines. That this is an utter mistake is plain from the fact that the greatest of all philosophers—Aristotle—fully recognized this distinction. Yet Aristotle was a Pagan, who cannot confidently be affirmed to have been even a true theist. No one surely, then, from fear of theology need hesitate to accept that view about man which was held by Aristotle.

But if rational beings may have arisen in the world thus unobtrusively, it may well be on the other hand that the Miocene chippers of flints, however well endowed with sense-perceptions and practical imaginations of means adapted to ends, were destitute of the idea of "Being," of the powers of analysis and synthesis, and

of the power of recognizing classes as such—in a word, may have been but brutes. Their chipping actions need have been nothing more than a further extension of those sensitive faculties by which brutes pursue an escaping prey, jump on mounds, or climb to reach what is out of reach, prepare stakes for their dam, as does the beaver, or employ a stone to crack a hard nut, as does that common ring-tailed monkey, the sapajou—actions such as those before described as being performed to complete a harmony which the imagination craves.

Man differs from all mere animals by his power of mental abstraction, which constitutes his distinguishing privilege and dignity. The products of this power, then, are by no means, as some persons suppose, matters to be slightly esteemed or even despised as "*mere* abstractions," but they are amongst the loftiest products of the human intellect. Human language is made up of abstractions, nor can the ploughboy any more than the sage refrain from using abstract ideas, though such ideas are of course much fewer and less refined in the ploughboy than they are in the sage. In "abstraction," lies everything in the intellectual order which is essentially human, and everything human which is essentially intellectual is abstract.

This consideration alone may suffice to show what studies are the best suited to develop the higher powers of the human mind and furnish it with fit intellectual food. Evidently it cannot be those studies which are most immersed in the material and concrete—such as are, in varying degrees, the different physical sciences—but those which deal with language and pure abstractions, such as classics and mathematics.

But if our power of intellectual abstraction is thus relatively lofty compared with our lower and animal powers, may there be other powers and another nature higher still?

Certainly we can conceive of a mental nature endowed with a much higher power—a power different from human reason by a difference not of degree nor of kind. It is, in fact, owing to the limitation of our faculties that we are obliged, in order explicitly to recognize the essential nature of any object, to ideally decompose and reconstruct it. But we can conceive of a nature of a higher order, able by one single intellectual act to comprehend that which we can only attain to by the complex process of (1) impressions on our sensitivity; (2) perception; (3); abstraction; and (4) recomposition. A nature endowed with such a power as this, would be higher than human nature, as human nature is higher than mere animal nature. Such a difference as this would contribute yet another limit to evolution—a limit forever rendering the evolution of man into a creature of such a lofty intellectual nature an impossibility. .

This limit, however, has little practical interest for us compared with that lower one which has occupied us almost exclusively here,—namely, the limit between men and brutes. This limit is marked by the possession or non-possession of the power of speech, and the power of speech makes a difference not of degree but of kind, because it serves to make known abstract ideas, and not merely to excite feelings sympathetic or otherwise.

If then all that is here urged is not fundamentally mistaken, the doctrine that man is nothing more than an evolved ape—which is the Darwinian doctrine—is a monstrous error. It is moreover an error which carries with it political and social consequences of the most momentous nature. No error can be greater or more fatal than that of supposing that philosophical, speculative views do not carry with them far-reaching and inevitable practical consequences. A generation, itself nurtured in the noble traditions which have descended to us from the days of Athenian culture, has tastes and sympathies due to that nurture, which it is but too apt to suppose must be permanent acquisitions which no subsequent intellectual changes can possibly destroy or degrade, but the history of mankind teaches us a very different lesson. The world is sown broadcast with the traces of civilizations which have passed away, and is scarred over by heroes made through the repeated triumphs of brutality over refinement.

But some of our readers may be inclined to ask, if the doctrine of man's evolution is a mere dream, how is it that so many men, eminent in physical science, well skilled in anatomy and learned geologists, are blind to its absurdity? The answer to this question is that the inquiry as to man's origin is one not of physical science but of philosophy, and that these fields of mental activity are hardly ever cultivated by the same persons with anything like the same care and attention. One or the other is neglected, avowedly or otherwise. Thus it comes about that men may be very distinguished for their knowledge of physical science, and yet be ignorant about the operations of their own minds and the nature of the intellectual acts they daily and hourly perform. Such is conspicuously the case in the present instance. The Darwinian doctrine is supported by men, and only by men, who are victims of the fundamental error which confounds "ideas" with "faint revivals of past feelings," and "association" with "inference." It is owing to this that no Darwinian, and least of all Darwin himself, has ever ventured to really grapple with the essence of the question.

The Darwinian view of man's origin is one due not to knowledge, but to the want of knowledge of what is most important respecting the question. It is not anatomy and zoology which have to decide as to man's place in nature, and no real progress can be made

in the investigation as to man's origin except by those who understand what man is now. The comprehension of this, and especially of the true nature of human language, will, we confidently believe, amply suffice to make plain the existence of at least one necessary and inevitable limit to evolution.

SOCIALISM.

SOCIALISM, in its technical sense, may be defined as that ethical theory which aims at the amelioration of man's social condition through community of goods, and co-operation in labor. It traces nearly all the ills of society to individual ownership, and to isolated individual effort, in the production and the distribution of the fruit of man's toil, and seeks to remedy them, by the removal of these two, as it declares, prolific sources of human misery. It has, thus, a twofold bearing, the one, theoretical, which finds its expression in Communism; the other, practical, which is called Co-operation.

Communism denies the right of private ownership, and places the dominion of external goods exclusively in the community, or in the government, as the representative of the community. A distinguished modern communist has declared ownership—individual ownership—to be theft, theft from the State. Thus, under this system, people might use external goods, but not own them, except in the sense in which a citizen of the United States is said to own the National Park, or the White House, a light-house, a revenue cutter, or a government ambulance. Some communists, from Plato to the Oneida Perfectionists, have extended this community of goods even to wives and children, whom they have regarded as property. The transfer of private property to the State, advanced communists think, should be effected by revolution. The more moderate advocate its purchase by the State, or, its gradual absorption by legislation. Others, recognizing the impracticability of these methods, would vest it in voluntary associations, based on community of goods, and of labor, till the whole property and industrial energy of the nation would be absorbed by them.

Communism is not a thing of recent date. It was defended in theory, and reduced to practice, long before the Christian era. It was advocated by Plato in his *Republic*, and incorporated by Lycurgus into his system of laws. In *The Republic* it is provided that children be taken away from their parents, and nurtured under the supervision of the State, lest their tender minds be biased by "the blasphemous nonsense with which mothers fool the manhood out of them." Education, marriage, the number of births, the occupations of the citizens, were, according to this philosopher, to be controlled by the State. The most perfect equality of conditions and careers was to be preserved. Women were to have similar training with the men. The inequalities and rivalries between rich and poor were to cease, for all were to be provided for by the State. (Book iv., p. 249, Joweth's translation.)

The Essenes, a Jewish sect that lasted from the second century before Christ, till the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, were practical communists, and we can trace a communistic tradition from the Manicheans of the third century, through different sects, to the Cathari, in the thirteenth, and the Anabaptists, in the sixteenth. Doctrinal errors, false theories of asceticism, the love of plunder, the oppression of the poor by the rich, combined in each succeeding age to make it more or less popular, and, sometimes, dangerous. "Brethren," said Muntzer, the prophet and leader of the Anabaptists, "we are all children of Adam; God is our father. And see what the great have done! They have, the wretches, remade the work of God, and created titles, privileges, and distinctions. They eat white bread, we have rough labor; they have fine clothing, we have rags. Does not the earth belong to all?—is it not our common inheritance? And they have taken it from us! When did we renounce the inheritance of our Father? Let them show us the deed of resignation. It does not exist. You rich ones of the time, who keep us in bondage, who have pillaged, oppressed, and mutilated us, restore to us our freedom, give us back our bread. It is not as men only that we now demand back what you have stolen from us, but as Christians. In the infancy of the Gospel, the Apostles divided with their brethren in Jesus Christ the money which was laid at their feet; give us back the Apostles' means, which you unjustly detain. Unhappy flock of Christ, how long will you groan in oppression, under the rod of government?" (Audin's *Luther*, vol. i., p. 417.) On another occasion he told his hearers: "Under God's heaven, every creature ought to be free, all property common,—air and water, fish and fowl, herbs and rocks." (Ibid., vol. ii., p. 137.)

During the two years in which he sought to enforce these doctrines by the sword, a hundred thousand men fell in battle, seven

cities were dismantled, a thousand religious houses razed to the ground, three hundred churches burnt, and immense treasures of paintings, sculpture, stained glass, and engravings destroyed. (Ibid.) But, every one knows how that war ended; how the unhappy peasants were slaughtered like sheep by the allied nobles of Germany, at Frankenhausen, and their leader beheaded. Luther, who had encouraged them to revolt, abandoned them, called on the nobles to crush them, and boasted of having done so. "For it is I," said he, "who have shed it (their blood) by God's commands, and whoever has fallen in this war, has lost body and soul, and is the prey of Satan." "I have done right," he adds, in another place, "in recommending against such caitiffs ruin, extermination, and death." "At the day of judgment," says Cochlous, "Muntzer and his peasants will cry before God and his angels, 'Vengeance on Luther!'"

About the middle of the last century, J. J. Rousseau, whilst living as a Sybarite, bewailed the miseries the division of the soil had entailed on humanity. During the Revolution, Babeuf and others taught, that all men had equal rights in all property, and in the enjoyment of it; that every exclusive appropriation of the soil, or of a branch of industry, was a crime; that all persons should receive the same kind and degree of education; that the functions of the government should be, to superintend the division of labor, the collecting of the produce in public stores, and the distribution of it to communities and individuals. (*Cyclop. Amer.*) Babeuf's later followers abrogated marriage, and wished all towns destroyed as the natural hot-beds of tyranny. Fourier, Louis Blanc, Proudhon, and other recent socialistic writers, have but elaborated most of these theses, with, however, some important modifications.

There are, at present, in the United States, eight communistic societies, divided into seventy-two separate communities, with about 5000 members, including children. The Shakers, established here in 1780, have fifty-eight of these communities. The Oneida Perfectionists, established in 1848, are the only society of strictly American origin. The others are English, French, or German.

The fundamental error of socialism, and the chief reason why it has been condemned by the Church, is, its denial of private dominion, or ownership. One would suppose that the belief and practice of all ages and nations would have made this right clear to all men. But we live in a time when the most obvious truths have lost their hold on the minds of thousands, not only among the ignorant, but even among those who are called educated. And this must be our excuse for undertaking to prove, before proceeding farther, that our farms, our houses, our furniture, our money,

our securities, and even the clothes we wear, belong to us individually, and not to the States of our Federal Union, nor to the government of the United States.

Dominion is generally defined, "the right to have, and to hold, and dispose of a thing as one's own, in any way not forbidden by law, or compact."

Now, how did individuals acquire this right in regard to external goods? Did they get it from the State? Certainly not. They had it before any State was formed. Was it derived from the compacts made between individuals, families, and classes of men, before civil society was organized? No, for these compacts suppose this right in those who made them. The very first man knew and felt that he had a right to live, and, therefore, a right to the means of living. His innate desire, too, of happiness, made him see and feel that he had a right, not only to the absolute necessaries of life, but to its rational enjoyments, also. But, how could he have enjoyed, or even supported life, without the right to own external goods? This, indeed, proves, directly, his right to the use only of these goods, but, indirectly, it proves his exclusive right to them, when he thinks this necessary to insure their proper use. He had the right to own a home, and the movable goods that belong to it, and a portion of the soil, if he deemed its occupation necessary, to secure for himself and his family the necessaries, or the comforts of life, and this, not only because "his right there was none to dispute," but because having occupied these things for the reasons and with the purpose just mentioned no one *could* have disputed it, even had there been any one to attempt to do so. Thus, he would have occupied and improved the soil, at the expense of his time and his labor, without interfering with the right of others to do as he had done, and reason dictates that a man has a right to the fruit of his own toil. Whether our first parent actually occupied a farm or not, is uncertain, though it may be safely presumed that he did, since we read in Genesis that "the Lord God sent him out of the paradise of pleasure, to till the earth from which he was taken."

For a long time, men's possessions were limited chiefly to flocks and herds and movable goods generally. To hold them in the peace and security necessary to insure their proper use, certain compacts were entered into by the owners, similar to those existing between the ranchmen on our western plains. Abraham and Lot, though just men, could not dwell together in peace. "Abraham, therefore, said to Lot: Let there be no quarrel, I beseech thee, between me and thee, and between my herdsmen and thy herdsmen; for we are brethren. Behold, the whole land is before thee; depart from me, I pray thee; if thou wilt go to the left hand, I will take the

right; if thou choose the right hand, I will pass to the left." (Gen. 13:8-9.) But as families multiplied, and as particular districts became more thickly settled, farms succeeded to ranges; villages, towns and cities sprang up; mining, manufacturing, and commercial centres were created; different kinds of proprietorship were established, and, *pari passu*, local, municipal, and state governments were organized, and laws enacted to protect and foster them, and the conditions determined under which property could be held, conveyed, and bequeathed. The people did not transfer to those governments their individual possessions. On the contrary, the governments were organized chiefly to protect and regulate private property by the authority and sanction of civil laws, or, in other words, the power of the communities was invoked to protect each individual member in what he had justly acquired. Individual ownership was thus established in accordance with reason and the law of nature, and it has been sanctioned, regulated and protected by the civil law of every nation, down to the present time.

The divine law, too, everywhere recognizes it. Cain was a husbandman, and Abel a shepherd, and the latter offered to the Lord "of the firstlings of his flock, and of their fat. And the Lord had respect to Abel, and to his offering." Would this offering have been acceptable, if ownership were theft? The Patriarchs, and many other eminent personages mentioned in the Old Testament, were distinguished for their wealth as well as for their piety. Abraham paid Ephron four hundred sicles of silver for the field in which he buried Tara (Gen. 23). Joseph, too, we read, bought all the land of Egypt, every man selling his possessions. The Decalogue forbade men to steal, or even covet their neighbors' goods. These prohibitions were reiterated and emphasized under the new dispensation. Salvation came to the house of Zacheus, though he did not renounce his wealth. "But Zacheus standing said to the Lord: Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and, if I have wronged any man of anything, I restore him fourfold." Jesus said to him, "This day is salvation come to this house." (Luke 19, v. 8-9.)

God, it is true, did not make the division of goods, such as has existed from the beginning, imperative on the human family. "The earth he hath given unto the children of men," but he did not say how it was to be held or enjoyed by them, whether individually, or in common. This he left to their own reason to determine. And they did determine it, in the manner already described.

When society was organized, it had nothing to determine respecting this matter. It had been already settled. All society, or governments, could do, was to recognize what individuals or individual families had done; to regulate, protect, and develop it. This,

and no more, they have continued to do, up to the present time. They did not introduce individual ownership; they could not and cannot destroy it.

An institution that had its origin in the needs of human nature, that has been sanctioned, upheld, and defended in all times, in all places, by every class of men, by the individual conscience, by public opinion, by legislatures, by courts of law, by the Church, by the State, in a word by every recognized judge of human acts and of human conduct, must be founded in natural justice, must be indispensable to the well-being of society, and the rights acquired under it should be held sacred by all men. No doubt these rights have been much abused in the lapse of ages. They are abused still in many places. But this abuse is no proof that they have ceased to exist, or that, though existing, they should be set aside. What earthly good, what gift of God is there that has not been abused? Do not the great majority of men abuse their natural freedom? Do they not employ health, talents, and life to offend, instead of to serve their Maker? Do not thousands in every land abuse the civil liberty they enjoy, not only by neglecting their civic duties, but by positive offences against law? The common sense of mankind dictates that the remedy for this abuse is not to deprive men of liberty, but to prevent the misuse of it by the ordinary means of reform, or where this cannot be done to punish it.

Community of goods is a thing not evil in itself and under all circumstances. Some writers think that if man had continued in the state of original innocence, individual ownership would not have been established. It existed among the first Christians at Jerusalem, and it has been practiced from the earliest times by the Religious Orders of the Church. This could not have been the case if it were in itself wrong.

From these two facts, however, no argument can be deduced in favor of Communism. It is not to be wondered at that community of goods should have existed among a people who had seen our Saviour, who had witnessed His poverty and heard the woes He had pronounced on the rich. They adopted it, however, not as of necessity or of precept, but voluntarily, and as a free exercise of detachment from the things of this world, which are the occasion of much temptation and of many sins to all classes of persons. This is evident from St. Peter's question to Ananias: "Ananias, why hath Satan tempted thy heart that thou shouldst lie to the Holy Ghost, and by fraud keep part of the price of the land? Whilst it remained did it not remain to thee, and after it was sold was it not in thy power?" (Acts 5 c.) It was not then like Communism, intended to become the basis of a political system; it did

not extend beyond Jerusalem, and even there it soon ceased altogether.

Religious Orders, too, are voluntary associations, whose members seek first their own spiritual perfection, and next, the spiritual and temporal good of their neighbors. Their aim is not to remodel but aid society as it is, and they do so by ways that are in perfect harmony with existing institutions. They instruct the ignorant, they minister to the poor and sick, they preach the Gospel in Christian and in Pagan lands. And that they may be able to discharge these duties with all the perfection possible in our weak nature, their members give up all personal claims to property, hold all things in common and obey a common rule, the wisdom of which has been tested by the experience of ages and approved by the most enlightened tribunal on earth, that of the Roman Pontiff. They must be persons of exceptional virtue, a virtue not to be looked for, and in point of fact never found, in the large number of men necessary to administer the civil affairs of a nation, much less in the majority of its people. They are admitted to membership only after long and mature deliberation on their own part, and when their superiors are satisfied beyond reasonable doubt of their fitness for the kind of life they are to lead and the works in which they are to be engaged. They practice community of goods without injury to others; they do it not for any material profit to be derived from it, but from the highest spiritual motives that can influence mortals. Its advantages, then, in the Religious Orders can give no assurance whatever of its success on a national scale and under widely different circumstances.

Community of goods is wrong only when made the basis of a political system as explained and defended by communists. Thus understood, there is nothing to recommend and every reason to condemn it. It denies the right of private property sanctioned by the law of nature, and recognized and protected by the laws and customs of all nations. It aims not merely at the relief of the poor and needy, but would take from the well-to-do what they have justly inherited, and the fruit of their toil and their savings, for the benefit of those who have no claim to either that has ever yet been recognized by any civilized people. The poor, indeed, have claims on individuals and on society that cannot be disregarded with impunity, but is it not repugnant to common sense to say that those who are not in need have a right to be made better off at the expense of others more industrious or more fortunate than they?

Then, such a system is utterly impracticable. If compensation were to be made to individual owners for what would be taken from them, where could the means of doing so be found? What government could pay for all the possessions of its citizens. To

attempt to do so by taxation would simply be to steal what they have by little and little.

And were the levelling process called for by Communism attempted by force and without compensation, is it to be supposed that any people would submit to it without rebellion and bloodshed? Would, for instance, the property-holders of this country, its farmers, merchants, manufacturers, bankers, storekeepers, and well-to-do mechanics and laborers, hand over their accumulated savings to a state or federal commune without a struggle, and do so for the benefit of men to whom they hold themselves under no obligations, and very many of whom are as great strangers to honest labor as the lilies of the field, and for a theory which, when reduced to practice in private corporations, has, thus far, almost always proved fallacious? They would perish first in their defence.

Nor would their experience of the administration of our public affairs be calculated to alter or modify their determination in this respect. Look at our city, state, and federal governments! If they are not greatly belied they are about the most corrupt in the world. In these bodies poor men grow rich, and the rich become richer, and everything is for sale but public virtue. No legislation, however just or necessary, can be obtained from them without paying for it in proportion to its importance, and they hardly give bread to the orphan without first taking a slice of it for themselves. Their schemes to enrich themselves by "jobs" and appropriations and blackmailing laws and ordinances, are so numerous and ingenious that men who have anything to be taxed look forward to their meeting with apprehension and experience a sense of relief when they separate and the members return to their homes. And what is said of the legislative is charged in no slight measure against nearly every other department of government in this country.

Now, if to these bodies were given control of the *entire* property, capital, and industry of the country, what would be the result? This much only I would venture to predict. They would gracefully accept the responsibility. They would administer their trust to the great relief of the former owners, and allow them and others the inestimable privilege of adding to it at pleasure. Politics would become the most popular of all pursuits, and the number of men anxious to serve their country in public offices would be greater than ever.

And yet these men have no ordinary incentives to fair dealing and fidelity in the positions they occupy. They are the chosen representatives of a free, intelligent, virtuous, and generous people. They have been called to serve a country the noblest the sun shines upon, and to uphold a Constitution which more than any other

framed by men recognizes the dignity of human nature. They live in what the down-trodden of other lands are accustomed to consider a political paradise, opened by the mercy of God and the merits of its founders to the oppressed of all nations. But, more than all this, they are Christians. They were nursed by Christian mothers? In youth they were instructed in the principles of right and wrong, read their Bible, and went to Sunday-school. They grew up under the influence of Christian teaching, and whether they will it or no, are still more or less under its influence, and obliged to respect the public sentiment of a people deeply penetrated by Christian ideas. But were they atheists, recognizing no moral law, without fear of hell or hope of heaven, men, in a word, such as modern Communism would bring to the management of public affairs, is it not safe to presume that their official debasement would be tenfold greater than it is?

And were Communism forced on a nation by a successful revolution, it could not last. It would make all equal, for a time, in the possession of external goods, but they would hold them only at the pleasure of the government. It would require all to work, but it would not allow each one to choose the trade or business to which he felt most inclined, and for which he thought himself best fitted. All this would be settled by the Commune, as would also the time to be devoted to work and the amount to be performed. It would, in a word, claim to regulate all the details of the public and private life of the citizen, for, as Mr. Nordoff says: "The fundamental principle of Communal life is the subordination of the individual's will to the general interest or the general will; practically this takes the shape of unquestioning obedience by the members towards the elders or chiefs of their society." "In some of these societies," says the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, "individual liberty is entirely suspended, the smallest minutiæ of the daily life of their members is regulated from headquarters. A government which decides at what hour its subjects shall go to bed at night and rise in the morning, which prescribes the color, shape, and material of the dresses worn, the time of meals, the quality of the food consumed, the daily task apportioned to each member, which enforces a rule that each of its subjects shall leave every morning a notice stating at what exact spot he or she will be found during each hour of the day—a government which can do all these things will find no great difficulty in controlling the number of marriages and births. . . . If, however, Communism were adopted throughout a whole nation, the minute despotism which distinguishes the government of existing Communistic societies . . . would cease to be possible, or if, indeed, it should ever become possible, it would be through the careful suppression of individual liberty and through

the strenuous encouragement of everything which tended to destroy self-reliance on the part of the people, and to build up the absolute power of the State. A people who purchased material prosperity at the price of their liberty would strike a bad bargain." Clearly, the only supporters of such a system would be the politicians whom it would enrich, a few theorists and dreamers who might honestly believe in it, and the poor whose condition it had bettered. All others, those whom it had brought down to the common level, and those who had hoped to rise above it would work and pray for its overthrow. Their feelings towards the government would be such as men might cherish for the band of brigands that had despoiled them, and then condemned them to menial service within their camp. But they would be controlled. The agencies that had achieved the revolution would uphold it for a time. The public revenue would flow into the treasury to be applied and absorbed by the new *regime*. Vast sums would be placed "where they would do most good," an army of placemen and dependants would be organized, and all the machinery with which usurped authority knows how to protect itself would be called into play to defend the new order of things. But in vain; government officials and dependants are in the minority in every nation, and the majority in no nation could long tolerate the unmitigated despotism of a Commune. Even those whom it had lifted up from poverty would soon be made to see that the loss of liberty, political, social, domestic, and personal, and of even the power to rise above the condition of well-fed slaves, was too much to have paid for mere bread and butter. They would tire of toiling for a public good that gave them but food and shelter, whilst it enriched their rulers and would unite with those whom the Commune had despoiled to destroy it, even if obliged to accept in its stead, the less ignoble bondage of a military dictator or a Russian Czar.

The rights of property have varied in extent at different times and in different places. According to Sir Henry Maine, in his work on Ancient Law, says J. S. Mill, "the primitive idea of property was that it belonged to the family, not to the individual." The head of the family had the management, and was the person who really exercised the proprietary rights. As in other respects, so in this, he governed the family with nearly despotic power. But he was not free so to exercise his power as to defeat the co-proprietors of the other portions; he could not so dispose of the property as to deprive them of the joint enjoyment or of the succession. By the laws and customs of some nations, the property could not be alienated without the consent of the male children; in other cases the child could by law demand a division of the property and the assignment to him of his share, as in the parable

of the prodigal son. By the Jewish law, property in immovables was only a temporary concession; in the Sabbatical year it returned to the common stock to be redistributed. . . . In many countries of Asia the ownership was broken up among several distinct parties whose rights were determined rather by custom than by law. The government was part owner, having the right to a heavy rent. . . . The actual cultivators, or such of them as had been long settled on the land, had a right to retain possession; it was held unlawful to evict them while they paid the rent—a rent not in general fixed by agreement, but by the custom of the neighborhood. . . . There were also, in many cases, village communities consisting of the reputed descendants of the first settlers, who shared among themselves either the land or its produce. . . . In Mediæval Europe almost all land was held from the sovereign on tenure of service, either military or agricultural; and in Great Britain, even now, where the services, as well as the reserved rights of the sovereign, have long since fallen into disuse or been commuted for taxation, the theory of the law does not acknowledge absolute right of property in land in any individual. The fullest landed proprietor known to the law, the free-holder, is but a 'tenant' of the crown." "It is a fundamental principle of English law," says Chancellor Kent (*Amer. Law*, vol. iii., p. 501), "derived from the maxims of feudal times, that the king was the original proprietor or lord paramount of all the land in the kingdom, and the true and only source of title. In this country we have adopted the same principle and applied it to our republican government; and it is a settled and fundamental doctrine with us that all valid individual title to land within the United States is derived either from the grant of our own local governments or from that of the United States, or from the crown, or royal chartered governments established here prior to the revolution." But though the crown in England, and in this country the government, are the original sources of title, the individual owner, in both countries, it is needless to say, has exclusive right to what he possesse . From all this it is manifest that, whilst the right to private property has been recognized everywhere and always, war and conquest, and the usages of particular countries have at times more or less limited or extended, and sometimes destroyed it. Modifications of this kind will continue to be made, for, apart from what war may do, it is the duty of governments to introduce them when demanded by the general good.

The case of a people that had been "educated up" to a voluntary acceptance of the Commune, I do not stop to consider here, as no such case has ever arisen, or ever can arise, till men shall have changed their nature. A people may be talked out of their

liberties, out of their virtue, out of their faith, out of the kingdom of heaven; but the one thing out of which they cannot be talked is their property. It is said that the best way to tell whether a Yankee is really dead or not, when there is any doubt on the subject, is to try to pick his pocket. I am of opinion that the experiment would be equally successful in the case of a man of any other nationality. It is not alone the selfish or the greedy that refuse to "sell what they have and give to the poor," but those who have kept the commandments from their youth. This sacrifice is only for the few who desire to be perfect. Others are not required or expected to make it, and we may rest assured they will not make it, even to "have treasure in heaven."

The chief claim put forward by Communists in support of their system is that it would at once remove the evil of poverty, so widespread under the present order of things. Poverty, no doubt, is an evil, and to those who live without God in the world it must appear one of the greatest of evils. Nevertheless, it is a physical, not a moral evil, and less to be dreaded and deplored than the slightest moral evil existing in society. One venial sin, a lie, for instance, is a greater evil than all the poverty that has ever afflicted and ever will afflict the children of men. Frequently poverty is the consequence of moral evil, of sloth, culpable indiscretion, imprudence, or helplessness caused by guilty excess. In too many cases, however, it is incurred without blame, as far as men can know, on the part of those who suffer from it. But whatever may have occasioned it, it is in the power of society, as at present constituted, aided by religion, to prevent or relieve it. I say aided by religion, for no society not aided by the principles of Christian charity has ever been able, or ever will be able, to prevent or assuage the sufferings of the poor. Christian society did both, in the ages of faith, before the Reformation, and after the Reformation, the Revolution, had appropriated and squandered the treasures which Christian society had amassed, and destroyed the institutions it had founded to relieve, to console, to educate, and elevate the poor. And society would do so still were it not divorced from religion and from all the tender influences of the charity it inspires.

The poor provided for, as a truly Christian society knows how to provide for them, poverty is no longer unbearable; it is even consistent with true happiness. Thus viewed, it must be regarded as simply an inequality of condition, which, like other inequalities of the same kind, cannot be remedied in this life. Nor will they cease even with life: "For star differeth from star in glory; so, also, in the resurrection of the dead." All are not equally endowed with mental gifts. Some are talented, others are dull of

comprehension; some have genius, others are idiots; some are strong, others are weak of body; some enjoy vigorous health, others are sickly; some have "the fatal gift of beauty," others are ugly and deformed; to some is given length of days, the majority are taken before they reach mature manhood; the lot of many is cast on a sterile soil and in an inhospitable climate, others live in lands that "flow with milk and honey."

These inequalities are irremediable in our present condition. Why should there not also be inequality in the possession of money and other material goods? Communism, indeed, professes to be able to remove it, but it could not do so save at the expense of liberty and of justice. No evil, physical or moral, can be remedied by a wrong, for "a house divided against itself cannot stand." The Commune would give bread to the poor for a time, but would make them slaves. It would prevent the return of the idle and vicious poor to the state from which it had rescued them by the prison and the lash, and whilst it would give the rest little more of material goods than they could obtain under any well-ordered Christian government, it would condemn them to toil at the pleasure of a task-master, and deprive them of all the higher and sweeter enjoyments that make life worth living in any condition. "Not by bread alone doth man live."

But poverty, it should be borne in mind, is but a temporal evil. It is often hard to endure, but its shadow does not fall beyond the grave. After death it will have its compensation. "Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted." "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of God." It is this thought that cheers and consoles God's poor under their privations, and gives them a peace of soul seldom experienced by the rich. The scientist, the agnostic, and the communist reject this view of poverty, but this is their fault or their misfortune. There are social problems, and poverty is one of them, that cannot be satisfactorily solved without the light of revelation, and all who seek so to solve them will have but their labor for their pains. The unbelieving poor can see no remedy for poverty but the fallacious one of Communism. "If I must have my heaven on earth," said one of them to M. Minghetti, "if I have no hope in another life, why should I be poor and leave to the rich all the happiness of life?" "You have taken from us the heavens with their joys and compensations," says the organ of the German Socialists to the Liberals of Berlin, "your science has destroyed the ancient faith. You have deprived us of the hope of hereafter, but we are determined at least to have the earth." Infidel statesmen and philanthropists will find it hard to refute this terrible logic. But this is not the logic of the Christian poor.

As to the other evils, moral or economic, charged by socialists against the present order of things, it must be said that they arise not from the system itself, but from the vices and defects of individuals, and that they would not be diminished, but aggravated, under the system which communists would inaugurate. It thus appears, says Mr. Mill—no unfriendly critic of Communism—that, as far as concerns the motives to exertion in the general body, communism has no advantage that cannot be reached under private property, while, as respects the managing heads, it is at a considerable disadvantage. It has also some disadvantages which seem to be inherent in it, through the necessity under which it lies of deciding, in a more or less arbitrary manner, questions which, on the present system, decide themselves, often badly enough, but spontaneously. It is a simple rule, and under certain respects a just one, to give equal payment to all who share in the work. But this is a very imperfect justice, unless the work is also apportioned equally. Now, the many different kinds of work required in every society are very unequal in hardness and unpleasantness. To measure these against one another, so as to make quality equivalent to quantity, is so difficult, that communists generally propose that all should work by turns at every kind of labor. But this involves an almost complete sacrifice of the economic advantages of the division of employments, advantages which are, indeed, frequently overestimated (or rather the counter-considerations are underestimated) by political economists, but which are, nevertheless, in the point of view of the productiveness of labor, very considerable, for the double reason that the co-operation of employment enables the work to distribute itself with some regard to the special capacities and qualifications of the worker, and also that every worker acquires greater skill and rapidity in one kind of work, by confining himself to it. The arrangement, therefore, which is deemed indispensable to a just distribution, would probably be a very considerable disadvantage in respect of production. But, further, it is a very imperfect standard of justice, to demand the same amount of work from every one. People have unequal capacities of work, both mentally and bodily, and what is a light task for one, is an insupportable burden to another. It is necessary, therefore, that there should be a dispensing power, an authority competent to grant exemptions from the ordinary amount of work, and to proportion tasks in some measure to capabilities. As long as there are lazy or selfish persons, who like better to be worked for by others than to work, there will be frequent attempts to obtain exemptions, by favor or fraud, and the frustration of these attempts will be an affair of considerable difficulty, and will, by no means, be always successful.

These inconveniences would be little felt, for some time, at least, in communities composed of select persons, earnestly desirous of the success of the experiment; but plans for the regeneration of society must consider average human beings, and not only them, but the large residuum of persons greatly below the average, in the personal and social virtues.

The squabbles and ill blood which could not fail to be engendered by the distribution of work, whenever such persons have to be dealt with, would be a great abatement from the harmony and unanimity which Communists hope would be found among the members of their association. That concord would, even in most fortunate circumstances, be much more liable to disturbance than Communists suppose. The institution provides that there shall be no quarrelling about material interests; individualism is excluded from that department of affairs. But there are other departments from which no institution can exclude it; there will still be rivalry for reputation, and for personal power. When selfish ambition is excluded from the field in which, with most men, it chiefly exercises itself, that of riches and pecuniary interest, it would betake itself with greater intensity to the domain still open to it, and we may expect that the struggles for pre-eminence, and for influence, in the management, would be of great bitterness, when the personal passions, diverted from their ordinary channel, are driven to seek their principal gratification in that other direction. For these various reasons, it is probable that a Communistic association would frequently fail to exhibit the attractive picture of mutual love, and unity of will and feeling, which we are often told by communists to expect, but would often be torn by dissension, and not unfrequently broken up.

It is needless to specify a number of other important questions, affecting the mode of employing the productive resources of the association, the conditions of social life, the relations of the body with other associations, etc., on which differences of opinion, often irreconcilable, would be likely to arise. But even the dissensions which might be expected, would be a far less evil to the prospects of humanity, than a delusive unanimity, produced by the prostration of all individual opinions and wishes, before the decree of the majority. The obstacles to human progression are always great, and require a concurrence of favorable circumstances to overcome them, but an indispensable condition of their being overcome is, that human nature should have freedom to expand spontaneously in various directions, both in thought and practice; that people should both think for themselves, and should not resign into the hands of rulers, whether acting in the name of a few or the majority, the business of thinking for them, and of prescribing how

they shall act. But, in communistic associations, private life would be brought, in a most unexampled degree, within the dominion of public authority, and there would be less scope for the development of individual character, and of individual preferences, than has hitherto existed among the citizens of any state belonging to the progressive branches of the human family. Already, in all societies, the compression of individuality, by the majority, is a great and growing evil; it would probably be much greater under Communism, except so far as might be in the power of individuals to set bounds to it, by selecting to belong to a community of persons like-minded to themselves. . . . .

Apart from all considerations of justice to the present possessors—says the same writer—the very idea of conducting the whole industry of a country, by direction from a single centre, is so obviously chimerical, that nobody ventures to propose any mode in which it should be done; and it can hardly be doubted that, if the revolutionary socialists attained their immediate object, and actually had the whole property of the country at their disposal, they would find no other practicable mode of exercising their power over it, than that of dividing it into portions, each to be made over to the administration of a small socialist community. The problem of management, which we have seen to be so difficult even to a select population, well prepared beforehand, would be thrown down to be solved, as best it could, by aggregations united only by localities, or taken indiscriminately from the population, including all the malefactors, all the idlest and most vicious, the most incapable of steady industry, forethought, or self-control, and a majority who, though not equally degraded, are yet, in the opinion of socialists themselves, as far as regards the qualities essential for the success of socialism, profoundly demoralized by the existing state of society. It is saying but little to say that the introduction of socialism, under such conditions, could have no effect but disastrous failure, and its apostles could have only the consolation that the order of society, as it now exists, would have perished first, and all who benefit by it would be involved in the common ruin—a consolation which, to some of them, would probably be real, for, if appearances can be trusted, the animating principle of too many of the revolutionary socialists is hate, a very excusable hatred of existing evils, which would vent itself by putting an end to the present system at all costs, even to those who suffer by it, in the hope that out of chaos would arise a better Kosmos, and in the impatience of desperation respecting any more gradual improvement. They are unaware that chaos is the very most unfavorable position for setting out in the construction of a Kosmos, and that many ages of conflict, violence and tyrannical oppression of the weak by the strong must intervene. They know not that

they would plunge mankind into the state of nature so forcibly described by Hobbes (*Leviathan*, part i., c. 13), where every man is enemy to every man. "In such a condition," says Hobbes, "there is no place for industry, because the fruit thereof is uncertain, and, consequently, no culture of the earth, no navigation, no use of the commodities that may be imported by sea, no commodious building, no instruments of moving and removing such things as require much force, no knowledge of the face of the earth, no account of time, no arts, no letters, no society, and, which is worst of all, continual fear and danger of violent death; and the life of man solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short."

"If the poorest and most wretched members of a so-called civilized society are in as bad condition as every one would be in that worst form of barbarism produced by the dissolution of civilized life, it does not follow that the way to raise them would be to reduce all others to the same miserable state. On the contrary, it is only by the aid of the first who have risen, that so many others have escaped from the general lot, and it is only by the better organization of the same process that it may be hoped, in time, to succeed in raising the remainder." (*Fortnightly Review.*)

And here, it may be remarked, that whilst all the leaders of communism are agreed as to the necessity of destroying the present order of things, they differ widely as to what should be put in its place. In the *Democratic Social Review*, of February 17, 1879, Pauliat writes: "All socialists, we repeat, are at one in regard to the object of their organization, but there is no slight difference amongst them as to the means of attaining it. In this regard the systems proposed are almost innumerable, and there are as many schools as systems. If the leaders had their way, some of them would turn France into a vast convent, others would make it a barracks, and others still, ignoring the natural dispositions of men, would organize an impossible society from which working-men would be the first to escape."

The other division or variety of socialism is, as I have said, Co-operation, or, the association of a number of individuals or societies for mutual profit, whether in the purchase and distribution of commodities for consumption, or in the production of commodities, or in the borrowing or lending of capital, or for mutual defence or protection in commercial interests or trades. The societies founded on this idea in Europe and America may be divided into the following classes: 1. Societies of consumption, the object of which is to buy and sell to members alone, or to members and non-members, under differing conditions, the necessaries of life or the raw materials of their industry. 2. Societies of production, the object of which is to sell the collective or individual work of the members. 3. Societies of credit, or banking, the object of which is to open

accounts of credit with their members, and advance to them loans for industrial purposes. 4. Societies of workmen, to protect the interests of the particular trades to which they belong. (*Encyc. Brit.*)

The principle of co-operation is also applied to many other societies, such as friendly societies, burial and building societies, and industrial partnership, or the admission of the whole body of laborers to a participation in the profits, by distributing among all who share in the work, in the form of a percentage on their earnings, the whole, or a fixed portion of the gains after a certain remuneration has been allowed to the capitalist.

To discuss the merits or demerits of these societies as business associations, would be foreign to my present purpose. I shall consider them in their moral bearing only. Thus viewed, they are, like all other societies, good or bad, according to the objects at which they aim, the means they make use of, and the character of the persons that compose them. The object of a particular society may be excellent, yet, if the means it employs to accomplish that object be unlawful, the society is to be condemned. And, even though the object be good, and the means used to attain it lawful, the bad character of the members would make it necessary for others to avoid it. For evil communications corrupt good morals. Christian men should not put themselves in intimate corporate relations with infidels and revolutionists, for any purpose whatever. Any and all of the above-mentioned societies, if organized by Communists, or in the interest of Communism, would be worthy of condemnation, because of the evil system of which they would be at once the outcome and the support. But if, recognizing the present order of things, they aimed only at the mutual profit of the members, they might be very meritorious organizations.

Workmen may associate to promote the interests of the trades to which they belong, but they cannot interfere with the natural or civil rights of others who do not belong to their associations. They may, for instance, as a rule, and where no undue advantage is taken of the actual necessities of employers, determine the rate of wages under which they will not work, but they cannot hinder others who are willing to work at lower rates. Every man has the right to hire his time and his labor on whatever terms he pleases, or even to give them for nothing, and he can be restricted in the exercise of this right only by public authority. But employers are not free to introduce bodies of cheap laborers into localities where usage has established the equity of certain rates of compensation. They can do so only when the demands of workmen have become extortionate or unreasonable, and even then they should pay the established rates to the new-comers. When bodies of men have chosen certain callings, they become, as a rule, unfitted for

others, and it is not just nor proper that the men whose interests they have promoted, should deprive them and their families of the means of a decent support. The wrong of such a proceeding would be greatly intensified if done in a place where workmen would be far removed from other fields of labor, and from which they could not move without considerable loss and expense.

Workmen can combine against the unjust encroachments of capitalists, but not against capitalists, as such. This would be absurd, as well as unjust. For, after all, what is capital? It is simply accumulated savings. It is the savings of men who have toiled at trades, in business, and in the professions, and which savings are now enjoyed by them, or by their heirs. The capitalist, then, has the same right to these savings that the day-laborer has to his hire. Then, how very little could the laborer accomplish without the aid of capital! It is capital that gives him land to till, mines to work, factories, workshops, mills, machinery, and so many other things that make it possible for him to find remunerative employment. And even when invested in banks or bonds, capital is of, at least, indirect advantage to him; for banks are now almost indispensable to trade and commerce; and governments and private corporations would find it very difficult to meet their obligations, and provide for necessary outlays without bonds. Capital, then, may be truly said to be the laborer's best friend. The relation between capital and labor is so intimate that employer and employed must necessarily stand or fall together. They should, then, cherish for each other, not distrust, but mutual forbearance and esteem. Workmen should care for the interests of their employers as for their own, and not take advantage of circumstances that may arise to enable them to enforce, by strikes and combinations, extortionate demands for wages. Employers, on the other hand, should not adopt a close and exacting policy towards workmen. They should not only not defraud them, in whole, or in part, of their hire, which is one of the sins that cry to heaven for vengeance; they should deal generously with them. They should give them such compensation for their labor as will enable them to live comfortably, in their station of life, to educate their children, and, with economy, to provide against such contingencies as sickness, accidents, or enforced idleness. They might establish for their benefit, reading rooms, libraries, gymnasiums, building associations, and insurance companies, of which they could avail themselves on easy terms. The larger corporations could do this, each for its own employés; the less powerful could combine for the same objects. Employers, in a word, should make all under them feel that they have their welfare at heart; they should study their wants, do all in their power to lighten their burdens, and give attentive consideration to every plan for improving the organization of labor,

that would be likely to better the condition of their employés without injuriously affecting their own.

Were employers and workmen animated by these sentiments, the trade of socialistic demagogues would soon be gone, and the unnatural struggle between capital and labor, that now threatens the peace of all civilized nations and the stability of most of them, would soon come to an end. Christian society is based on justice and charity. Where these are respected, it will endure. Where they are disregarded, it must perish. "Unless the Lord keep the city, they labor in vain that keep it."

There is no danger, at least for long years to come, that Communism will become generally popular in this country, much less that it will change or seriously affect its institutions. The American people, it is true, have scant reverence for the past and its precedents. They have given Mormonism, Millerism, and Perfectionism a trial; and there is hardly a conceivable social or theological theory for which they are not prepared to do the same, on a small scale. But neither of two things can they ever, as a nation, be induced to do: they will become neither monks nor soldiers; or, as Mr. Pauliat would say, they will not suffer this country to be changed, either into "a vast convent," or "a vast barracks." Nor can such a change be forced upon them, for, those whose best interests depend on the present order of things, whose material condition Communism could not improve, and who have sense enough to see the intrinsic wickedness and folly of this system, will always be sufficiently numerous to prevent it. Their misapprehension of the real nature of Communism and the European Revolution generally, has led many of them to sympathize with both—a thing very much to be regretted—but, beyond this, Communism cannot influence them to any serious extent.

Nevertheless, there are very grave dangers to be apprehended from Communism in the United States. In nearly all our great commercial and manufacturing centres, there are societies, either avowedly communistic or largely under the influence of communistic ideas. They are thoroughly organized, and, in some instances, drilled and armed for the struggle they predict, and which, their leaders say, they are determined to precipitate, between capital and labor, in this country. All the elements of disorder amongst us are in sympathy with them. Our great and ever growing army of tramps would rally to their support, in any crisis that might arise. Property-owners and law-abiding citizens generally, regard them with ever-increasing alarm. To withdraw their workmen from their influence, and prevent their gaining absolute political control of our cities, large firms and railroad companies are dis-

tributing their factories and shops over the country districts of every State. But the influence these organizations wield at the polls, makes them courted or feared by our politicians, who cannot be induced to favor the legislation necessary to avert the evils they may cause at any moment. The destruction of even one of our large cities would be a fearful calamity, yet who will say that it may not be brought about any day by these societies, some of which seem to be animated by the very spirit of the Paris Commune? It is but a few years since Chicago seemed, for a time, to be at their mercy, and when, in all probability, it would have been laid in ashes but for the determination of the Irish regiment that had been called out to defend it. The danger for that and other cities is not over. It becomes every day more threatening; and, unless proper precautionary measures are taken to avert it, the consequences may be deplorable. Should the injury to life and property to be apprehended from these societies actually ensue, in a single instance, their suppression all over the country would follow as a matter of course. But prevention is better than cure. They should be permitted to meet and organize and theorize as much as they please, but they should not be permitted to arm and drill for the avowed purpose of forcing their theories on others at the point of the bayonet. Men so ignorant or so foolish as to dream of attempting anything of the kind here can be no better than lunatics, and lunatics should not be allowed the use of deadly weapons. Good citizens of the nationalities to which the members of these societies belong, should try to make them understand, that in this country liberty does not mean license, but the protection of every man in his rights, under the Constitution and the laws. The representatives of the press should keep the public informed of their proceedings, and remind them, from time to time, of what they must expect, should they proceed to acts of violence against property or persons. The municipal authorities in the cities where these organizations exist, should keep a close watch on their movements, especially in times of public excitement, so as to be prepared, if necessary, to meet force with force, should they attempt a disturbance of the peace. There is, in all our great cities, much inflammable material, moral as well as physical, and dangerous popular commotions may arise there, at any moment, from unforeseen and insignificant causes. In a country where we may be said to have, practically, no standing army, even a small body of thoroughly organized desperadoes can, at such times, do infinite mischief before they are put down, unless the authorities are prepared beforehand to repress them. What occurred so recently in Pittsburg and Chicago should be a warning to these and other cities to prepare for like contingencies in the future.

THE CHAPELLE DES MARTYRS, AND THE SEPTEMBER MASSACRE.

A RELIC OF THE REVOLUTION.

Le Convent des Carmes et le Séminaire de Saint Sulpice pendant la Terreur. Par Alexandre Sarel. Librairie Académique de Didier et Cie. Paris, 1863.

AN ancient building is one of the most effective means of keeping alive the memory of historical facts. Without some such tangible aids the most important events of the past are apt to become dim and unrealizable. Any one who has visited Rome will understand this. And every nation has places hallowed by some stirring association in its history which right-minded persons will do their utmost to maintain. The opposite disposition has been characterized by an opprobrious epithet which is current in every European language—*vandalism*. Unhappily, with all their taste in other things, the French have very frequently been guilty of vandalism. They entirely fail to see that the location of an edifice upon French soil does not morally constitute it French property, if in such edifice events have transpired in which the world at large takes an interest. The destruction of the library of the Louvre by "a mob that could not read," of the Hôtel de Ville, and the Tuileries, proves this iconoclastic spirit, a sort of frenzied desire to erase every record of the past. And it is certainly a sure way of doing so. If we recollect how difficult it is to recall events that transpired a millennium ago, even by these aids, what would it be if we had only imagination to trust to? If Battle Abbey were destroyed, how few would realize the Conqueror and his memorable landing. The Black Prince would be as misty as King Arthur but for his tomb, his sword, and his armor in Canterbury Cathedral. And in this country the Pilgrim fathers get more indistinct as time advances, requiring the Plymouth Rock and other relics to keep their memory green.

But the reverence which all Americans show for the ancient buildings of Europe is proof that they need no argument to convince them of the expediency of preserving them.

When, however, the mason and the builder are bent on demolishing such, there is a duty devolving upon the historian to gather, as it were, the green mosses from their hoary walls, to relate their story, and allow these "sermons in stones" once more to claim

attention. Especially, when their record is that of *martyrs*, not such as are enrolled in the scroll of fame, but the mightier multitude whose sufferings are unrecorded, "martyrs by the pang without the palm."

A very ancient edifice of this sort at Paris is now in process of demolition. In a year or two trim streets and brand new houses will completely obliterate it, and it will be fortunate if even its site is preserved by the name of a street. This is the Chapelle des Martyrs. It is not difficult to understand why this building has always been such an eyesore to the ultra-republicans of Paris. It was doomed to destruction by the Commune of 1871, and the successors of those fierce anarchists have clamored for its destruction ever since. They have a very strong argument in their favor in the increased value of the site for commercial purposes.

An excellent friend of ours, whose delight is in rescuing the records of such places from oblivion, a modern "Old Mortality," invited us to visit the partly demolished edifice. As we paced its gloomy corridors and its silent garden, and stood on the very spot made so memorable by an awful crime, we felt an irresistible desire to relate its story—the bare facts, which need no embellishment—a story of heroism in confronting death worthy of "the brave days of old."

One thing that struck us was the *utter untrustworthiness* of the brilliant account of the chamber in which the Girondists were confined, so well known to the reader of Lamartine's *Histoire des Girondins*. Soon the walls where Vergniaud and his companions traced their names and dying thoughts will be as utterly vanished as their own political dream. But let not any one credit Lamartine's narrative, for others besides ourselves, notably the late Monseigneur Cruice, Bishop of Marseilles, have detected his intentional errors.

The Chapelle des Martyrs is, as probably most persons know, the scene of the September massacre. It is situated within the inclosure of an edifice that played a most distinguished part in the first Revolution, the Carmelite Convent in the Rue de Vaugirard. The prison of the Abbaye and the Temple, around which Sir Archibald Alison has thrown so much interest, have entirely disappeared. But up to the spring of last year, when we saw it, the Carmelite Convent remained almost as perfect as it was in 1792. It had been in turn a monastery, a barrack, a public ball room, and a prison. Our friend, at the suggestion of the late eminent antiquary, M. Dupon, has devoted three years to investigating its true story, supported by historical documents. The bare narrative of the principal event which has made the place famous needs no embellishment, and completely refutes many unfounded

slanders with which some would-be historians have defamed the illustrious dead.

The monks of Mount Carmel first appeared in France in 1254. They had been persecuted in their Syrian rocks and followed St. Louis to Paris, where they took up their abode in a mean habitation. In 1309 Philip the Fair gave them a large house situated near the Place Maubert. Later on, in the reign of Philip the Tall, they purchased the buildings of Dace College, contiguous to their own. They reconstructed the monastery and added a church on the Rue St. Hilaire. Things went on unchanged until the end of the 16th century, when certain monks of the order reformed certain abuses that had crept into it. They changed the dress to white and brown, and wore sandals, which gave them the name of *Discalced Carmelites.* Two of the reformers were sent by Pope Paul V. with special recommendations to the Court of France. Marie de Medicis was Queen Regent, and on the 23d September, 1610, a royal decree was issued, authorizing the Carmelites to establish themselves in Paris and Lyons. After some hesitation this decree was ratified by the Parliament.

A gentleman of great wealth, named Vivyan, bought a large house and garden for them, and the foundation of their church was laid by the Queen-Regent on the 20th July, 1615, with great pomp and ceremony. The edifice was consecrated seven years later.

The Carmelites greatly increased in numbers, and continued to build and acquire property, so that a few years after their installation we find their buildings covering a very large area. It was bounded on the east side by the Rue Cassette, on the west by the Rue du Renard, on the north by the Rue Cherche-Midi, and on the south by the Rue de Vaugirard. The rents accruing from their house property in the Rue du Renard amounted, in 1790, to 66,176 livres.

This large area included spacious gardens, which were *useful* as well as ornamental. The monks, in imitation of those of Chartreuse, employed their chemical skill in extracting from herbs and flowers a cunningly concocted liquor, known as *Eau des Carmes*, or *Eau de Melisse.* It is still to be had, though some people say it is but a ghost of its former self. The sale of this beverage was highly remunerative. One account in the archives of the Paris Hôtel de Ville sets the sum down at 3000 livres a month. They got a patent from the King to protect it. The monks bore an excellent reputation for charity and piety. They were renowned preachers, and had published many useful works. These details will enable the reader to appreciate sundry allusions in what follows.

We come now to the beginning of 1789 and the convocation of

the States General. The people of Paris had been invited to elect their own deputies, and, to facilitate matters, the city was divided into sixty districts. One of these was called the *District des Carmes*. The meeting of the electors was held in one of the halls of the monastery.

The famous *séance* of the *Jeu de Paume*, the dismissal of Necker, the speeches of Camille Desmoulins, the mistakes of the Prince de Lambese and his regiments, had stirred Paris into a violent frenzy. In various quarters the people rose and demanded the immediate reassembly of the electors. The result was the formation of the citizen guard of thirty thousand men, into whose hands the safety of the city was committed. This meeting took place July 13th, 1789. Next day the Bastile was destroyed.

At first the relations existing between the public politicians of the Quarter and the Carmelites were most amicable. On the 17th July, the Prior had been requested to act as treasurer of the contributions of the citizens. The church was placed at the service of the committee, and all the meetings were opened by the recitation of the "*Veni Creator.*" Later on, September 17th, 1792, the monks offered a portion of their premises as a barrack. They were reconstructed at the cost of the community itself, who expended 32,260 livres, 21 sols.

But the monarchy was hastening to its fall, and while these events were transpiring the well-known discussion of February 13th, 1790, had taken place in the National Assembly. The following bill had passed in consequence.

"ART. I. The constitutional law of the kingdom *no longer recognizes the solemn monastic vows of persons of either sex.* In consequence all orders and congregations in which such vows are made and exist, *are, and shall remain, suppressed in France without power of being re-established in the future.*

"ART. II. All persons of either sex residing in monasteries and religious houses may leave them upon making declaration before the local municipality, and they will be provided with a suitable pension. Note shall be taken of all such houses where such persons as decline to profit by this present disposition still remain."

On the 5th May, the city was divided into *sections*, and from this period the *District des Carmes* is lost in the *Section du Luxembourg*, destined to such sinister notoriety. A new decree was passed October 8th, 1790, which regulated the future status of all monks and nuns.

The Carmelite Convent contained at this period sixty-four members, of whom forty-two were priests and the remainder laymen. They were invited to answer the query whether they would continue to be monks or not. Eight priests accepted their liberty and

the convent was then placed under the care of the municipality, which elected its own Superior. The utensils required to fabricate the *Eau de Melisse* were confiscated, and the monks were compelled to buy them back for sixty thousand livres.

On the 27th May, the Assembly, pressed by the Paris sections, passed a decree deporting all ecclesiastics who refused to take the oath of allegiance to the government. The refusal of the King to sanction this decree hastened his overthrow. It was but a month later, June 20th, when the Faubourgs assembled *en masse* at the Tuileries, and compelled Louis to put on the cap of liberty. The throne had in reality already fallen, and with it the Church which he had vainly striven to uphold.

The President of the National Assembly, Gensonne, was authorized to nominate commissioners, charged to invite the people "to take such measures as would insure the punishment of crime by the law." The Council General of the Commune of Paris issued a proclamation on August 11th, containing these words: "Sovereign People! Suspend your vengeance! Justice, which slumbered, today resumes her rights. All the guilty will perish on the scaffold."

Instructions were at once issued to arrest large numbers of priests and nobles, who were incarcerated in the Carmelite church. The *Section du Luxembourg* was particularly active, and unhappily this Section comprised by far the largest number of religious houses. The air was rife with threats of blood. On the 11th August fifty priests were arrested and imprisoned in the convent. One of their number, the Abbé de Barbôt, thus describes the scene:

"Having heard that some national guards had called at my house to conduct me to my Section, I at once repaired to Legendre,[1] to ascertain what he wanted. He ordered me to go into an adjoining room, where three persons approached me and asked if I was a priest. I replied, yes; and they sent me into another room, where I was soon joined by the Archbishop of Arles. This was about two, and we remained until nine o'clock, when we were called, searched, and added to sixty other ecclesiastics, the whole of us being marched off under guard to the Carmelite church. On our arrival a soldier was placed over each one of us, and we were forbidden to speak. We had bread and water given us, and, up to the sixth day, we slept on the pavement of the church. Those who had the means were then allowed to procure mattresses; but we could not obtain permission either to say or to hear Mass. Our prison continued to fill every day."[2]

Besides the Archbishop of Arles, two other prelates of the illus-

[1] The famous butcher, nominated President of the Section du Luxembourg, June 30th, 1792.

[2] Les Martyrs de la Foi, par l'Abbé Guillon, vol. i., p. 163.

trious house of De la Rochefoucauld were arrested—the Bishops of Beauvais and Saintes. They were brothers, and inseparable companions, always sharing the same room. When the Bishop of Beauvais was arrested, his brother, the Bishop of Saintes, came forward and said: "Gentlemen, I have always been united to my brother by the ties of the tenderest friendship. Since, then, his love for religion and his horror of perjury constitute all his crime, I am just as guilty, and therefore beg to go with him to prison." Their crime was set forth as being "*servants of a person whom they call God.*"

One of the prisoners records a touching act of charity on the part of a lady "who would not allow her name to be mentioned." She supplied twenty priests with food all the time of their imprisonment. "Imagine," says the Abbé Barruel, "a medium-sized church, whose floor is crowded with mattresses up to the very altar steps. We slept better than our persecutors, although we never knew but that the executioner might come during the night. When we got up in the morning all knelt for secret prayer, begging that we might have courage to confess the name of God to the last. At mealtime every piece of food was examined to see that it did not contain letters or instruments of death. The physician requested permission for us to walk in the garden, as there was danger of contagious diseases breaking out. Two hours per day were allowed us, one in the morning and the other in the evening. Sometimes we were all allowed to go out together, sometimes only a part. An oratory at the bottom of the garden was a very pleasant meeting-place. It contained an image of the Blessed Virgin."[1]

On the 23d August, according to Pétion, one of the Sections sent a deputation to the Council of the Commune, threatening to force the doors of the prisons and immolate the prisoners. The petition, couched in the wildest terms, was received with loud expressions of approval.[2] Next day, Tallien, in the name of the Commune, thus expressed himself before the Assembly:

"We have arrested conspirators, who have been placed in charge of the tribunals for their own safety and that of the state. We have arrested the perturbing priests, who are confined in a special place, and in a few days the soil of liberty will be purged of their presence."[3]

No one, however, suspected a massacre. Robespierre, Danton, Fabre d'Eglantine, and Tallien tried to procure the release of certain of the prisoners, but in vain. The better to conceal the hor-

[1] Histoire du Clergé pendant la Revolution Française.
[2] Moniteur, November 10th, 1792.
[3] Moniteur, September 2d, 1792.

rible project, the unhappy prisoners were buoyed up with hopes of a speedy liberation. The Procureur of the Commune called several times, assuring them of their safety, inquiring where they would go on their release, and in every way deceiving them. Finally, on the 31st August, he came and informed them that the Prussians were at Verdun, and that it was decreed to send all the priests out of France. He bade them prepare for their journey, and promised that they should be allowed to remain a few hours at their respective dwellings for the purpose. At midnight a *commissaire*, accompanied by gensdarmes, called them together, and read the decree of exile, which was fixed up in the sanctuary of the church. The poor prisoners collected all the money they could in view of their prospective journey. They were about a hundred and twenty in number.[1]

Despite these promises, a presentiment of coming evil seems to have weighed upon their minds. Those who deny the immortality of the soul ought to explain how it is that the coming evil is apprehended by the mind or soul, or, whatever you call it, long before it is felt and tangibly realized by the body. We know how the delicate Mimosa feels the vibration of the horsehoop long before the rider is in sight. And, what Shakespeare calls "the mind's eye" is capable of foreseeing "things invisible to mortal sight." This case of the doomed clergy seems singularly apropos.

No remarkable incident occurred during the 1st September. One of their number declared, "we shall never leave this place." His views began to be shared by the rest, and each prepared for a last confession. A meeting was held to discuss the question, whether they should take the oath proposed. A large majority decided to refuse it. And in this steadfast spirit they saw the morning of Sunday, the 2d of September dawn.

The investment of Verdun by the King of Prussia and the Duke of Brunswick called forth a vigorous proclamation, ordering the erection of barricades and the general rising of the population. The situation in the Carmelite church grew worse every hour, as the popular excitement increased. The surveillance redoubled, and the prisoners were carefully searched. The friends of some of their number called, and, by their melancholy manner, their tears, and affecting partings, it was easy to see that they foresaw some proximate disaster.

After dinner, a *commissaire* of the Section came to call the muster-roll. This ceremony always took place before and after the promenade. An old servant of the Archbishop of Arles usually called the roll, and the presence of the *commissaire* was excep-

[1] Recitinedit de l'Abbé Montfleury.

tional and significant. The promenade was deferred until later. Directly the *commissaire* had gone, the guard was changed. It was composed of men without uniform, armed with pikes, and wearing the red cap. At four o'clock the order was given to go into the garden, and even the sick and infirm were obliged to obey. The way from the church was through the chapel of the Blessed Virgin, and a small sacristy adjoining it, on the left-hand side of the choir. These led into a corridor, at the end of which was a staircase, leading into the garden. This part of the garden, destined to become so memorable in history, is almost the same to-day as it was then. It was a morning in early March when we visited it. The weather was mild, despite the late severe frost and snow, and some of the shrubs were putting forth coy buds and shoots. But no amount of sunshine could dissipate that "strange depression all around," which we struggled against in vain. The garden consists of four large parterres, divided by gravelled walks. It had been laid out apparently with small regard to effect, and, where flowers once grew, the grass was growing feebly. In the centre is a large circular fountain of huge stones, coated with moss, and choked up. On one side of this garden rose the bleak old walls of the convent, and to the north a house occupied by some nuns, Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament. The Rue Cassette ran along the eastern side, and on the west were other gardens and dependencies of the Carmelites. The boundary walls are still adorned by fine trees and ornamental shrubs of great age. It is easy to picture the terrible tragedy that here occurred. The most conspicuous object is a small stone oratory at the bottom of the garden, whose only decoration is a wooden image of the Blessed Virgin. It is a poor, rude effort, very much worm-eaten and defaced. But upon what awful scenes has its expressionless eyes looked down! The only furniture of the oratory are two wooden benches.

The prisoners, having entered the garden, separated into groups, and dispersed about the alleys. One only, the Abbé Geraúlt, stayed beside the fountain, and began to read his Breviary. Meanwhile, the "General Assembly of the Luxembourg Section" was holding a stormy meeting in the Church of Saint Sulpice, under the presidency of Joachim Ceyrât, to "deliberate upon what measures should be adopted in the general interest." In the meeting were numerous Marseillais, who had come by invitation. When the meeting had been opened, a tavern-keeper named Louis Priere got into the pulpit, and declaimed vehemently on the gravity of the situation. The enemy was at Chalons, and, they must march at once upon him; but, for his part, he would not move a step until those shut up in the prisons were got rid of,

especially the priests detained in the Carmelite convent. His speech produced a deep excitement, but his proposition was received with repugnance. Profiting by this feeling, a watchmaker named Carcel took the floor, and remarked that, doubtless there were guilty persons in prison, but among them were many innocent and well-disposed citizens. Certainly no honest citizen would wish to imbrue his hands in the blood of the innocent. He proposed to nominate a commission composed of six members, elected from the meeting, in order to ascertain those who had crimes alleged against them, and deliver them up to justice. This motion was received with approval, but the chairman, Ceyrât, opposed it, exclaiming, "All the prisoners in the Carmelite convent are guilty, and it is time that the people execute justice." This speech revived the energies of Priere and his partisans, and the first motion was put, and carried by a large majority. Three commissioners, Lohier, Lemoine, and Richard, were sent to the Commune to communicate this resolution, "*afin de pouvoir agir d'une manière uniforme.*"[1] It was supposed that all official record of this meeting had perished, but M. Alex. Sorel, the eminent antiquary, discovered in the archives of the Palais de Justice the following document, which is of the greatest value to history:

"SECOND SEPTEMBER, 1792.
"Fourth Year of Liberty. First of Equality.

"Upon the motion of a member to purge the prisons, by causing the blood of all the prisoners in Paris to flow before the departure; the vote being taken, the motion was adopted. Three commissioners were named, MM. Lohier, Lemoine, and Richard, to proceed to the City, and communicate in order to act in a uniform manner. A true extract.

(Signed) "HUÉ, Secretary of the General Assembly."[2]

As these commissioners received this document of authorization, one of them, Lohier, asked the assembly, how they proposed to get rid of the prisoners "*in a uniform manner.*" The president and several others exclaimed, "*By death!*" "What do you mean by the *removal* of Cassio?" "Knocking out his brains."[3] No sooner were the words pronounced, than all those who had supported Priere's motion, with the Marseillais, rushed out of the church in the direction of the Carmelite convent. M. Carcel repaired at once to the commandant of the National Guard, *Tanché*,

[1] The Register of the deliberation of the Section du Luxembourg during the month of September, 1792, has disappeared. But M. Granier de Cassagnac has copied verbatim the extract from the *procès-verbal* of that day's sittings, September 2, from the *Histoire particulière des Evénements*, etc., by Mathon de la Varenne,—*an eye-witness.*

[2] Archives of the Palais de Justice. Dossier des Septembrisations. Deposition of M. Lemaitre.

[3] Othello.

and begged him to protect the prisoners. He refused. The bloodthirsty rabble soon reached the convent, and spread themselves about the corridors and the cells overlooking the garden. There they awaited the signal to commence their deadly work, meanwhile thrusting their pikes through the grated windows, and uttering the most ferocious cries. To escape from them, the prisoners retreated to the little oratory at the bottom of the garden, where certain of their number were reciting the vespers for the day. Fresh cries and shouts became audible from the Rue Cassette, where a most fearful tragedy was transpiring.

At one o'clock, four vehicles, filled with priests, left the Mayor's Bureau, in the Rue de Jerusalem, and proceeded towards the Abbaye Saint Germain. Among the prisoners was the Abbé Sicard, instructor of the deaf and dumb, who gives the following account of this terrible episode. "The signal to go forward was given, with a recommendation to the drivers to proceed very slowly, under penalty of being killed in their seats. We were overwhelmed with every species of insult. The soldiers who accompanied us informed us that we should never reach the Abbaye, for, the people, to whom they were about to deliver us, were at length going to take vengeance on their enemies, and would stop us on the way. These threatening words were accompanied by thrusts from pikes, and blows from sabres. The vehicles started, and the populace commenced to crowd around, shouting all kinds of blasphemy and abuse. 'Yes,' said the soldiers, 'these men are your enemies, the accomplices of those who have surrendered Verdun; they are only waiting your departure to kill your wives and children. Here are our sabres and pikes! Kill! kill these monsters!' It is easily imagined how this language, with the news from Verdun, was calculated to excite the naturally irascible populace. The multitude increased every minute until we reached the Abbaye, where our assassins awaited us. The court-yard was filled with an immense crowd, which surrounded our carriages. One of our comrades opened the door and dashed into the crowd, trying to escape. He was almost torn to pieces and his body trampled under foot. A second repeated the attempt, but a woman thrust him through the neck with a pike. A third was slaughtered in like manner. The vehicle advanced towards the room where the *comité* was sitting, when a fourth person got out. He was struck on the head with a sabre, but escaped alive. The assassins, thinking there was no one else in this carriage, passed on to the second."[1]

Twenty-one prisoners perished in this way in the court-yard of the Abbaye. The carnage was accomplished by a mere handful

[1] Relation de M. l'Abbé Sicard, p. 102.

of men, led by an ex-convict named Maillard. When the last victim had expired, Maillard exclaimed, "There is nothing more to do here; *let us go to the Carmelite convent!*"

Inebriated and delirious with blood and wine, the miserable wretches took up the cry and rushed away, shouting, "*Mort aux réfractaires!*" These were the cries caught by the unhappy prisoners in the garden of the Carmes.

The moment that the ruffians at the cell windows heard them, and, as if waiting for this signal, they hastened away, forcing in the door of the garden, where they divided themselves into two parties. The first group passed down the central walk, and met the Abbé Girault still reading his Breviary, and so absorbed in its study that he seemed to be ignorant of what was passing. With one blow from a sabre his head was cleft in two, and he was dispatched with pikes. When the first victim had fallen, the Abbé Salins hastened toward the assassins, hoping to wean them from their dreadful purpose. A shot from a pistol struck him dead in the midst of his speech.

The second group passed down an alley to the left, at the end of which was the oratory previously described. They had not gone far ere they encountered a number of ecclesiastics, among whom was the Archbishop of Arles and the Abbé de la Pannonie. They took hold of the latter and demanded if he was the Archbishop. Hoping to save the life of Monseigneur Duleau, he merely joined his hands together and made no reply. But one of the assassins detected the real prelate and exclaimed:

"You scoundrel! You are the Archbishop of Arles?"

"I am," replied the prelate.

"Villain!" rejoined the leader of the band, "it's you that have shed so much blood of the patriots in Arles."

"I never did harm to anyone," was the reply.

"Well! I am going to do harm to you," he said, at the same time striking the Archbishop on the head with his cutlass.

He received the blow without wincing or taking any notice. A second blow opened his skull. He raised his two hands to his head and *one was hacked off;* then a thrust from a pike stretched him on the ground lifeless. One of the wretches thrust his pike into the Archbishop's chest with such violence that the iron-head could not be withdrawn. Then, taking up the severed hand of the victim, he carried it off as a trophy.[1]

The death of the Archbishop caused the liveliest joy to this band of murderers, which was shown in the most ferocious shouts. While they were mangling his remains the other priests took refuge in the oratory. "We cannot be in any place so fitting," said one

[1] Histoire du Clergé pendant la Revolution Française, par M. l'Abbé Barruel.

of them; "there let us offer up our lives to God." They all knelt down in silence to pray, and it was thus that their assassins found them. No one knows what passed. The number of the corpses and the quantity of blood and brains scattered on the walls showed the rage with which these defenceless victims were assailed. Nearly all those who had taken refuge in the oratory were slain. The Bishop of Beauvais was struck by a bullet which fractured his thigh. On seeing him fall they thought him dead, but his agony was destined to endure much longer.

Other scenes not less terrible were going on in other parts of the garden. Two priests in trying to escape were shot, and yet these events only occupied *a quarter of an hour.* The assassins were suddenly brought to a stand-still by a commanding voice, bidding every person in the garden to enter the church. This was the captain of the guard, accompanied by a *commissaire* named Violette, deputed by the Luxembourg Section to arrest the massacre. From another quarter a voice exclaimed, "Stop! Stop! That is not how you are going to do things." This was the band of Maillard, which had just arrived.

The unhappy priests who had escaped death tried to obey the captain of the guard. But the pikemen presented their weapons, and they were saved with difficulty at his most urgent solicitations. The greater part of the ecclesiastics had fled to the sanctuary and were huddled together behind the altar. There were only a few in the choir. Three were hidden in a recess leading to the pulpit, and two others in a small lateral chapel, while the Abbé Dubray concealed himself between two mattresses. When the Bishop of Saintes reached the choir he asked for his brother, who a few minutes later was brought in and laid on the floor. Two other clergymen, the chaplain of the Genoese Embassy and the Abbé de Keravenier, took refuge in the commodity, where they overheard all the murders, but declared that the victims never uttered a cry. They were afraid of discovery and climbed up through a small window in the wall on to the roof. Here they remained, barely sheltered by a tree, from half-past five in the evening until half-past seven next morning.

The sans-culottes poured into the church and ranged themselves in a line across the chancel to prevent any escape. The *commissaire* Violette ordered a table to be placed at the head of the staircase leading to the garden. He seated himself, and with the register of the prison in his hands, summoned the priests before him two by two to assure their identity. They were then ordered to descend by the staircase to the garden. The murderers were awaiting them there, but the attitude of each victim was heroically calm and even joyous.

When the Abbé Galais was called he handed over to the *commissaire* a purse of three hundred and twenty-five livres to pay the *traiteur* who had supplied food to the prisoners. It appears from official documents that the functionary put it into his pocket and forgot the trust. The priest in addition offered his own watch and chain and begged him to give them to the poor.

When the name of the Bishop of Saintes was called he tenderly embraced his brother in silence, hoping that his terrible wounds would arouse some pity and save him from death. But no sooner had he passed the fatal door than the murderers rushed into the church and called for the Bishop of Beauvais. They had to carry him to his doom, as he was unable to walk, and at the foot of the staircase his soul joined that of the brother he had loved so well. "In death they were not divided."

In less than two hours *one hundred and twenty priests* had been massacred. The number would have been still larger but for some most providential escapes.

After the death of the Bishop of Beauvais the general slaughter ceased. A part of the band left for the prison of the Abbaye, singing "*Ça ira*," and brandishing their pikes still dripping with gore. The remainder stayed in the church or the halls of the convent drinking and gambling.

About nine o'clock, those that were in the church heard a slight noise in one of the chapels. They seized a light and proceeded to investigate. It was the Abbé Dubray, who had concealed himself between two mattresses, and was absolutely compelled to move in order to breathe. They dragged him to the sanctuary and hacked him to death with sabres. This was the last victim of that terrible day of which we may well say:

"*Excidat illa dies ævo nec postera credant*
Sæcula!"

A few hours later the public were admitted "*au spectacle*." So deeply had the appetite for revenge been aroused in the people that not one person expressed the least pity for the innocent victims. A great many kicked and mutilated the corpses, while all pillaged them. Passing themselves off as *commissaires*, several of these ruffians visited the houses lately occupied by the priests and carried off everything they could find.

So large a number of corpses scattered about was by no means convenient, and became dangerous to the salubrity of the neighborhood. Consequently, the secretary of the Luxembourg Section, Daubanel, was instructed to bury them as soon as possible. He went to the convent on the morning of September 3d, collected all the bodies and ordered them to be unclad. The vultures began to quarrel over the spoils, and it was necessary to decree that "each

shall have one garment, and the surplus be sold for the good of the poor." A few hours later two large wagons were brought into the convent garden, into which the corpses were thrown pell-mell.

Three days previously, that is, on the *first* of September, the gravedigger of the Cimetière de Vaugirard had received orders to dig a large pit, for which he received three hundred francs. To this grave the martyred dead were carried, the wagons "shooting in" the ghastly load. Lime was plentifully scattered over the bodies and the grave was filled in. The cemetery was at the foot of the Rue de Vaugirard, and is still to be seen inclosed by walls. The sainted remains of the priests were exhumed a few years since and received fitting burial.

Some writers have tried to make out that this massacre was an unpremeditated act of vengeance—the outburst of popular rage, as unreflecting as it is violent. This argument seems disposed of by the fact that *the grave of the victims had been prepared the day before.* Much doubt as to the exact locality of this tomb has been set at rest by the discovery of the following document in the archives of the Prefecture of the Seine.

"M. Daubanel, Secretary, nominated to superintend the inhumation of persons who yesterday suffered the just vengeance of the people, has made report of his mission, and informs us that one hundred and twenty persons were interred this morning in the Cemetery of Vaugirard."[1]

The spoils of the dead amounted to 30,845 livres, 6 sols, 6 deniers; besides a further sum of 2444 livres, forty gold watches (one enriched with diamonds), fourteen silver watches, and one in pinchbeck. No account is given of the after disposal of these things.

The few escapes from the savage fury of the Septembriseurs are more exciting than any romance. They can only be described in one phrase, *Providential.*

The following is the narrative of the Abbé Berthelet de Barbôt:

"The number of prisoners had been reduced to twenty, and we were ordered to take our turn. As I was about to descend the staircase, at the foot of which were the murderers, I was recognized by several persons who lived near my house. They begged my life of the commissary, and I was ordered to be placed apart. The captain of the guard contrived to thrust me and six other priests under some benches. All the rest were massacred. It was only by the greatest labor and effort that our guards managed to pass through the immense crowd that surrounded us, and who clamored for our blood.

[1] Dossier des Septembriseurs, *Procès-verbal* of the sittings of the Luxembourg Section, September 3, 1792.

"At length we reached the Church of Saint-Sulpice, where the Section was sitting. The commissaire presented us to the Bureau, to be dealt with as the Section determined. A man rose, and proposed to deliver us to the people, who were waiting to destroy us. This motion was first approved, then rejected. It was finally agreed to keep us separated, with two guards to each, until we could be examined. The examination lasted until midnight, when the commissaries adjourned. A hall of the seminary, which had been converted into a prison, was appointed for our resting-place. We had only been there an hour, when one of the murderers came to complain, in the name of his comrades, that they had been deceived. They were promised *three* louis, whereas they had only received *one*. The commissaries replied, that there were still enough persons in the prisons of Saint Firman and the Conciergerie to last two days longer, and, besides, there were the clothes. To which the man replied, that, not knowing that they were to have the clothes, the prisoners were hacked so much with sabres, that their garments would be valueless. He, the speaker, would see if we had on new clothes, and he came to us, and rudely examined our clothing. Mine was old, and in many places threadbare, and my companions were in the same condition, and the terrible wretch, smelling of human blood, seemed dissatisfied, but soon left with the commissary. Next day we were set at liberty."[1]

The Abbé Saurin owed his safety to an equally strange circumstance. He was waiting his turn to be killed, when he heard one of the murderers speak in the Provençal accent. He went up to him and said, "My friend, you are from Provence?" "Yes," replied he, "I am from Marseilles." "And I, too," said the abbé. "What is your name?" "Saurin." "Oh, your brother is a relation of mine." "Then," rejoined the abbé, "you ought to get me out of this, since there is no charge against me but being a priest." The Marseillais turned to his companions, and said, "This man is my relation, and ought not to perish but by the law." "He is as guilty as the others, and must die like them!" cried the mob. "Citizens!" rejoined the Provençal with vehemence, "I was at the Bastile, on the 5th and 6th of October at Versailles, and at the Tuileries on the 20th of June. Look at my wounds!" and he opened his vest, where not the slightest scratch was perceptible. The public was moved, and allowed him to conduct M. Saurin to the Section. When they had reached the neighboring street, the man demanded a new overcoat that the priest wore. M. Saurin was glad to exchange it for the fellow's uniform coat. He asked

[1] Martyrs de la Foi, p. 200.

some recompense for his services, and was promptly rewarded with 200 livres. He then walked off in silence, leaving the prisoner free.

The Abbé de la Pannonie came even nearer to death. He was talking to the Archbishop of Arles when the murderers entered the garden. When that prelate had fallen he fled, and found himself in the shrubbery. The order was given to enter the church. "Seeing," says he, "that they were bent on our destruction, I murmured one last prayer and went forward to meet them. I passed through the chapel of the Blessed Virgin, when a national guard whom I did not know seized me by the arm and said, 'Save yourself, friend.' He pointed to the corridor, but there I met several men who attacked me with bayonets, and I received nine severe wounds. I tried to ward off the bayonets with my hands, for the space was very narrow and the brigands could not use their weapons freely. I rushed away into the garden, and another national guard tried to save me from my pursuers. His entreaties prevailed on the captain of the guard to order me to be set aside. The benevolent guard concealed me behind a door, but several of the assailants tried to reach me even there. I asked my friend if he hoped to save me, and he replied affirmatively. I took out my purse containing six hundred livres, and begged him to accept it. He refused, declaring that he would be sufficiently recompensed if he saved my life. The loss of blood from my wounds was very great, and I was growing weaker and weaker. When the mob poured in to see the dead bodies, I was advised to pass through it and take my chance. This I did, and the people were too much engaged in pillaging the dead to notice me." He found himself in the Rue de Vaugirard, where he recollected a shop kept by an acquaintance. The good woman dressed his wounds, and concealed him inside her counter during the domiciliary visits. He subsequently got a passport to England. Relating his adventures to an English gentleman, he showed him a vest thrust through with bayonets. He begged for it as a relic, and ordered the priest a complete suit of velvet in exchange.

Some contrived to escape otherwise, though, as it were, "by the skin of their teeth;" among them the Abbé Vialar. He was on the left side of the garden when the murderers entered. His first impulse was to commend his soul to God. Then his eye caught the boundary wall, and he resolved to climb it. He succeeded, and called to the Bishop of Saintes, who was near, to follow him. "I cannot leave my brother," was the reply. Having surmounted the wall, M. Vialar found himself in a small inclosed court, bounded by another wall still higher. One corner of this inclosure was the rear wall of the oratory before mentioned. He

could hear the dying groans of the victims just murdered, and the howling of their assailants. With the greatest difficulty he managed to scale the other wall, and found himself on the roof of an empty house. In one room was a mattress, upon which he fell, exhausted, and slept several hours. At night he climbed through a window and escaped into the city.[1]

Another priest, M. de Montfleury, got over two walls unperceived and dropped into the garden of the Marquis de Bréze. In his fall he broke the skylight of a small conservatory, and two ladies in an adjoining apartment, imagining him to be a burglar, tried to give an alarm. He begged them to desist, explained who he was, and was allowed to depart. Being without a hat, and very wild in his appearance, he was recognized in the street as fleeing from the convent. Fearful of being suspected themselves, several persons gave chase. The Abbé Montfleury saw a vehicle ahead, raced toward it, and, by large bribes, succeeded in winning the driver.

M. de Rest climbed up by a vine just as a bullet knocked the hat from his head. He managed to reach the top of the wall. In the garden below stood a ferocious ruffian armed with a sharp pitchfork, who rushed at him furiously. He was on the alert for any prisoner who might try to escape that way. The gardener's wife interposed, holding her infant between the infuriated sans-culotte and the priest. The weapon was finally wrested from his hands. M. de Rest departed, carrying it with him as a further protection.

In the *Description Historique des Prisons de Paris*, M. Saint-Edme tells the following remarkable story: "On the day of the massacre a pious woman, learning that her confessor was among the slain, conceived the desire to give the body Christian burial. Hearing the dead cart going by, she ran to the window, and saw among the bodies that of her confessor. Her doctor was at the house, and she entreated him to get the wagoner to sell the body. The man consented to let her have her choice for twenty crowns. The body was taken into the cellar preparatory to burial, and the surgeon went down to inspect it. *He found it living.*" The Abbé Tessier thus accounted for his deliverance: "When I saw them killing my unfortunate companions, I threw myself among the corpses, and escaped with only a few wounds given by the wretches who tore off my clothes. I was unconscious a good deal of the time from loss of blood, and might have been buried alive had you not interfered." All there fell on their knees and thanked God.[2]

Forty-four ecclesiastics in all escaped the massacre.

[1] Martyrs de la Foi, vol. ii., p. 195.

[2] Description Historique des Prisons de Paris, p. 161.

Although this appalling crime was evidently premeditated, the manner of its accomplishment was determined on by a few demagogues in the greatest haste. It is presumable, however, that they acted under superior direction. Pétion declared that the deed "was necessary to purge the empire of dangerous men, and to strike terror into the souls of conspirators, and that these crimes, though *morally* odious, were *politically* useful." When Tallien was assailed with the epithet "*massacreur de Septembre*," he replied, "I did my duty on that occasion, and I shall still do it in unmasking the instigators of that terrible day who sit in your midst."

Out of fifty persons arrested for the September crime *three* only were sentenced to twenty years in chains. The rest were acquitted. Joachim Ceyrât, one of its prime movers, escaped scathless.

Those who regard this act as the outcome of pent-up wrath, produced by centuries of bad government and social wrongs without end, as something belonging to the bad old times, the half barbarous past, must have been startled by its repetition on May 24th, 1871.

The facts connected with this crime may be timely repeated, when so loud an outcry is raised against the French clergy. They furnish, moreover, a striking historical parallel.

On the 5th May, 1871, the Archbishop of Paris and the other hostages were transferred from the prison of Mazas. They were huddled by couples in the compartments of the prison van, in which one person alone would have been inconvenienced. The drive across Paris was torture. At the meetings of the Commune, in the most violent journals and clubs, the death of the hostages was demanded. The victims asked in vain for a trial. The invariable answer was, "La Commune ne fait pas de la justice; elle fait de la Révolution." Deputations from the people called at the prison to assure themselves that none of the hostages were absent. On the 12th May they were transferred to the prison of the Roquette. The Archbishop, the President (Chief Justice) Bonjean, the Abbé Deguerry, curé of the Madeleine, the famous Jesuit electrician, Père Clerc, the Abbés Ducoudray and Allard, with Monseigneur Serra, Coadjutor-Archbishop of Paris, were crowded in an open cart, *used to transport manure*. The delirious populace heaped upon them every species of blasphemy and insult. Their guards were selected from the worst battalions of the quarter, commanded by a wretched drunkard named Verig, chosen expressly by Ranvier to aid in the premeditated murder. Not relying on his adherents, he sought additional volunteers from Genton. The latter declared that, in order to restore confidence to the Communists, it was necessary to strike a heavy blow. This would prove that they were not afraid of their responsibility or of death on the barri-

cades. A court-martial was instituted, and he was named President. He is described as "a dirty old man, who rarely washed. His beard was clotted with tobacco juice, and he emitted a fetid odor. The habit of incessantly scratching himself proved that his garments were thickly inhabited, and that the vermin liked him better than his friends, who never adhered to him at all." He refused to allow the accused to be heard either personally or by counsel. The whole trial lasted but half an hour, and Genton himself wrote out the sentence.

Between four and five o'clock Genton had collected men from the Sixty-sixth Battalion in sufficient numbers to form the firing party, and sent them to the prison of the Roquette. While following them he met a woman named Prevost, concubine of one La Chaise, whom he informed of the projected deed. The woman entered the prison with him. She was the *vivandière* of the Sixty-sixth, and insisted that the party should not be exclusively composed of men belonging to that battalion. By disputing with Verig, who had command of the executioners, she succeeded in withdrawing a considerable number, and departed with them. A large group of national guards had collected near the prison gates. There was indescribable confusion. Pay had been distributed to most of the soldiers, and the women took part in the distribution. Everybody drank, and soon the crowd was drunk and riotous.

At seven o'clock fifty armed men arrived with three delegates of the Commune, distinguished by their red scarfs. One of the commanding officers was Piquerre, commandant of the Thirty-fifth. This was the real firing party. They entered the prison, and Piquerre, brandishing his sword at Romain, the chief turnkey, sent him to fetch the prisoners.

Romain proceeded to call the roll, and the six victims left their cells. M. Bonjean wished to re-enter his, but Romain prevented him with brutality, saying, "What do they want to do with you? You are well enough as you are." Another came out slowly, and this ruffian exclaimed, "Shall I come and fetch you out?"

When the six victims were mustered, Romain conducted them by a small staircase to an open space near the infirmary. This was intended as the place of execution, but they could not open the door. While Jeannard and Verig tried to open it, Romain disputed with them, and recommended them to change the place, remarking that they would be too much in sight. The firing party assailed the victims with the most obscene insults, and brutally pushed them about. The Archbishop attempted to speak, but was prevented by blows and insults to such an extent that one of the Communists interfered, remarking, "You do not know what may happen to yourselves to-morrow."

This terrible scene at last ended. The Archbishop knelt down and prayed in silence. He then rose and pronounced a last benediction on his friends kneeling around him. These six Christians rose more confident and resigned to meet a terrible death, and the funeral procession continued its march. The Abbé Allard led the way, chanting in a subdued voice the "*De Profundis.*" He was preceded by Romain, who marched with both hands in his pockets, and with a careless air, as if performing some ordinary duty. The Archbishop walked after the Abbé Allard, accompanied by M. Bonjean. Then the Abbé Deguerry and the Fathers Clerc and Ducoudray. The Communists surrounded them, marching in disorder. A fresh halt was occasioned by finding a gate locked, of which the key was wanting. While a turnkey went to fetch it the Archbishop attempted to pronounce a few words, but was silenced by insults. The key was found, and they passed on. After that we have no direct evidence of what followed. Six minutes later a prolonged subdivision fire was heard with two short intervals, and then some isolated shots. This was at four minutes before eight o'clock. The victims fell exactly where their bodies were found, for the wounds corresponded to the pools of blood on the ground. They were ranged on their backs nearly parallel. The Archbishop to the right hand, then M. Bonjean, the Abbé Deguerry, and Fathers Clerc, Ducoudray, and Allard. The heads of the latter rested on the body of Père Ducoudray.

After the murder the soldiers retired by the court-yard. Verig, when leaving, showed a pistol to Periet, the turnkey, and said: "You see it is still smoking; I have just used it to give the last stroke to the famous Archbishop."

Another remarked, "That old canaille would not die; he rose three times, and I began to be afraid of him."

Outside they boasted that they had gained fifty francs, and Romain and François proceeded to search the cells. In that of Père Allard they found nothing. There was a discussion in that of the Archbishop over his pastoral ring, and they nearly came to blows over the division of the spoil.

At two o'clock in the morning, Verig, Romain, and several others, lighted by lanterns, proceeded to the place where the crime had been committed. They searched the bodies, tearing the clothes, snatching off buttons, etc., in their haste. Then Latour threw the bodies of the Archbishop and the Abbé Deguerry into a small hand-cart, and, escorted by Communists, they left for the cemetery of Père la Chaise. Latour dragged the cart and the rest pushed it. At the cemetery the bodies were placed in a common grave already prepared. The party returned for the other corpses,

but Garrard was too drunk to go the second time. Verig paid the men sixty centimes each.[1]

This is sufficient to prove that there exists an inextinguishable animosity, on the part of the dangerous class, against religion and its ministers. The clergy represent that order and obedience to law which this class almost instinctively detests. They delight, when opportunity serves, to visit their hatred of religion upon its votaries. Everything indicates that, if this element in French and Belgian society preponderate to-morrow, similar atrocities would be perpetrated. The clergy themselves, very naturally, but very illogically, associate these tendencies with republicanism. But they are as opposed to it as to monarchy. We do not call the semi-anarchical specimen of republicanism seen in Europe the genuine article. The fact is, under every form of government, there exists a distinctive class, generally too much repressed by law to be largely dangerous. It is only when the law is withdrawn that we see the unbridled display of passions which are only restrained by FEAR, as the wild beast is by the lash. The hell in their souls runs riot as soon as their cowardly natures feel that they have no fear of penalties. The only safeguard of society against the preponderance of this ever-aggressive element is that "righteousness" which "exalteth a nation," erecting, in its honest and peaceable citizens, impregnable bulwarks against every *form of wrong*.

[1] Evidence at the trial of the Communists at Versailles, January 27th, 1872.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND POPULAR EDUCATION.

THE work the Catholic Church is doing in our day and country in the effort to foster and promote Christian education is plain to the world. In spite of obstacles and difficulties—in the face of legislation that everywhere operates unfairly against her, and of a public opinion that is either hostile or indifferent, the Catholic Church steadily demonstrates her zeal for education by establishing and multiplying schools and institutions of learning, in order to afford in every parish and to every community the blessed advantages of a system of education from which *God* will not be excluded, and where Catholic youth shall receive a thoroughly Christian training.

In this beneficent and heroic work the Church shows that she is faithful to the traditions of her venerable past.

Her zeal for schools and generous patronage of science and learning is not a new manifestation. The fact is as old as the Church itself, and shines out in glorious prominence on every page of Catholic history in every land; during the earliest ages, as in later times, down even to the present day.

It may not be regarded as a useless task to devote a few pages to the duty of showing precisely what has been the attitude of the Catholic Church regarding this question of common schools and popular education; and it may be not altogether in vain to seek to demonstrate that, far from opposing the wide dissemination of knowledge, the Church has been the steady and consistent friend and patron of science and learning. And not, as is sometimes asserted, in favor of the few,—seeking to confine its advantages to a special class, or classes,—but rather has labored from the beginning to extend and enlarge the opportunities of education so as to bring its blessings and advantages within reach of *all* her children, even to the humblest degree and the lowliest condition.

The unjust outcry raised against the Church on this head proceeds, it is true, from the shallow-minded and the ignorant, the weak partisan and the intolerant bigot; but this class, unhappily, are too often the sonorous oracles of Protestant pulpits, glib declaimers in the popular lyceum, and, more dangerous opportunity still, are to be found in the highest places, as in all the gradations of popular journalism.

Indeed it is scarcely extravagant to assert that no charge and reproach against the Catholic Church is more familiar to the public ear, and no other is pressed with greater vigor and pertinacity than

this ridiculous and unfounded charge, that she is, or at all events *has been* hostile to popular education, unfriendly to common schools, and opposed to the enlightenment of the masses of the people. "Wherever that Church has been able to wield power and to employ her resources unfettered," say these hostile critics, "she has shown herself hostile to education; has everywhere sought to cramp and fetter the mental powers and the intellectual activity of her subjects—in a word has been a bar and an obstacle to the mental as well as to the social and political advancement of peoples and nations."

Nor is this language confined to avowed enemies of the Church; it is the familiar burden of the so-called philosophies and popular histories and text-books; it is repeated *ad nauseam* in well-known educational organs, and it is the favorite and fruitful theme for the essayist and the encyclopædist. How often do we not see quoted, as in triumphant and conclusive testimony of the justice of these allegations, "priest-ridden Italy," "benighted, retrograding Spain," and "poor, ignorant, Catholic Ireland?"

We shall now proceed to examine these inculpatory charges, and endeavor to show how altogether shallow and unsubstantial is the basis they rest on.

It will be shown that, from the earliest period in the history of Christianity down through every succeeding age, the Catholic Church has been unceasingly solicitous to foster and promote education. It will be made manifest in the countless schools established by her authority and under her patronage; and by her constant and unremitting efforts to encourage and propagate a general zeal in the cause of science and knowledge; and this zeal moreover was not merely in favor of schools for the wealthy, for ecclesiastics, but specially and notably shown in providing schools for the poor, *free schools.*

There is a more or less generally widespread impression and belief that the existing system of free schools is of comparatively modern origin, and the claim has been put forward that New England is entitled to the glory and credit of having first instituted the system, which has since been so widely disseminated.

We shall see that free schools existed far back in what are ignorantly stigmatized as the "dark ages," and that traces of their existence will be found even in the first ages of Christianity. Facts are not wanting to show that Ireland may justly lay claim to the honor of having been almost the first among the nations of Europe in zeal for education and learning.

Historians now acknowledge that the schools of Ireland were not only *free*, that is, education was given *gratis* in the Irish schools to all, but even books, food and lodging were supplied to students

who sought her shores from the neighboring islands, and the continent, but, Ireland went a step further—and here is a shining fact which, we may venture to assert, is unexampled in the laws or history of any nation,—*the masters of Irish ships were bound to give free passage to those who sought to find in the schools of that island masters in the sciences and sources of knowledge which could nowhere else in that age be found in Europe!*

This is a subject and period, however, which more naturally will present itself in illustration at a subsequent page of this sketch.

In the earliest ages of Christianity, that is to say, between the first and second centuries, we read of the *Catechetical schools* founded by the bishops in Alexandria (the same that was lately the focus of public attention), Cæsarea, Antioch, and Rome. The letters and epistles of the first Popes and Bishops abound in exhortations and instructions to the heads of churches and to the faithful to promote in every way the establishment of schools for the education of Christian youth.

In one respect at least there is a curious and suggestive affinity between the pagan system of education in the time of the Cæsars, and the modern State methods—instance the design of *Julian the Apostate*, who endeavored by means of "unfriendly legislation" to suppress in the schools all Christian teaching. He forbade the Christians to have schools of their own. "If the Christians fancy," said the Emperor in one of his outbursts of fury, "that the sentiments of the pagan authors are derogatory to the majesty of their Gods, then let these Galileans be content to explain Matthew and Luke in their churches." A declaration like this does not sound altogether strange and unfamiliar to the modern ear. Have we not somewhere and sometimes heard that "six days in the week should be given in the schools to secular knowledge—one day is enough for God!" Six days for the science of the world, the multiplication table, and only one day for the Commandments, for God, and Eternity! The writings of the early Fathers, and the annals of the primitive Church abundantly testify to the zeal for education shown in those early ages; the proofs would cumber these pages with quotations; indeed, as to the early Church our proposition would not be seriously controverted.

It would be admitted by some that the zeal for schools grew naturally out of the development from Roman and Grecian civilization, and the already existing enthusiasm for knowledge; while others would acknowledge it as due to the influence of the "purer Christianity" of the Church of the first ages. We shall see.

The wonderful civilizing and educational mission of the Church

was never more conspicuous than when that same Roman civilization and power was tottering to its ruin, when barbarian hordes thundered at the gates of the imperial city, and the empire and even civilization itself, as then existing, seemed doomed to destruction—utter and complete. Europe was then one vast camp of aroused and vindictive barbarians bent on a destroying, desolating career. The imperial legions had failed to stay their march, the walls of proud Rome could not withstand their assault.

It was this awful power that the Church was to confront, to awe, to conquer, and, more difficult task still, to *civilize*, to *educate*. These barbarous hordes had shown themselves intractable to every humanizing influence. The material grandeur of the world's famous capital moved them not; its majestic monuments excited no wonder; its magnificent architecture inspired no awe; its exquisite creations of art stirred no sensibility. All these would have perished by their destructive arm and pitiless torch, but for the intervention of the benignant power of religion. The Popes saved Rome from the terrible wrath of the *Hun* and the vengeance of the Vandal and the Goth. They rescued society; they preserved civilization. "But for that intervention," says a writer in the *Dublin Review*, "Rome at this moment would be numbered with Nineveh and Sidon, the foxes would bark upon the Aventine as when Belisarius rode through the deserted forum, and shepherds would fold their flocks upon the hills where St. Peter's and St. John Lateran now dazzle the eye with splendor."

This may seem to be a digression from the subject, but it serves to bring out and emphasize the great, nay the stupendous task subsequently undertaken by the Church in setting herself to the duty of moulding and directing the new civilization.

If, at the present day, we may point to the restraining and civilizing power of the school and the influence of educational training and methods, surely we may be permitted to refer to the mighty task undertaken by the Catholic Church, when a Pope awed by his majesty and turned back by his entreaties and threats, a barbarian army from the gates of the imperial city; and still more the wonderful and striking change which was wrought over these same savages and their successors under the benign power and the educating influence of the Roman Pontiff.

One after another the Popes eagerly entered into the work of establishing schools and providing for the education and the moral improvement of the people. Gregory the Great was conspicuously the patron of schools. He founded and endowed a great number of schools for the instruction of the poor, and recommended to the Bishops in distant countries to provide similar institutions in their respective dioceses. He was also the originator of *singing schools*,

and we owe to his influence and good taste the ecclesiastical music known as the "Gregorian," which remains to this day the standard sacred music of the Church.

Spain, in the sixth century, had its Cathedral schools in every diocese; and it was provided in the Council of Toledo in that century, that "all children offered by their parents should be brought together under one roof and be instructed under the superintendence of the Bishop." So likewise in France. Thus, in the year 800, the Council of Orleans urged on the parish priests the duty of "establishing schools in every town and village, *and of giving gratuitous instruction to all children.*" Surely these were essentially *free schools?* In 813 the Council of Mayence directed the clergy to "admonish their parishioners to send their children to the monastic and parochial schools;" and like injunctions were issued by Councils held in Rheims, Tours, and other episcopal centres at nearly the same period.

That of Romain, 826, enforced on Bishops the obligation to "found episcopal seminaries in the cities, and parochial schools in all towns and villages where the necessity existed." Leo IV. in the ninth century commanded the Bishops to provide for the erection of schools, and required that they should give a statement of their quality and efficiency in the provincial synods. The third Council of Lateran laid down, in one of its decrees, that "since the Church of God is bound as a pious mother to provide that every opportunity for learning should be afforded to the poor, who are without help from patrimonial riches, in every Cathedral there should be masters to teach both clerks and poor scholars *gratis.*" This injunction was extended to other churches by Innocent III., who required that "each should be provided with the means to furnish gratuitous instruction." Thus we again stumble across "free schools," and in the "dark ages" too!

The memorable reign of Charlemagne abounds in proofs and illustrations demonstrating the zeal of this great Catholic monarch for schools and the promotion of learning. We may read in the *Capitularies* his commands and advice to the Bishops throughout the empire urging them to establish schools for the poor, and to second his efforts to promote the spread of knowledge and learning. Guizot and other historians relate how Charlemagne sought in Ireland and brought from that country masters of science and philosophy to adorn his court and teach in his colleges.

In A. D. 823, Lotharius, the grandson of Charlemagne, published an edict for the creation of schools, and in the preface to it says: "Let the masters appointed by us to teach, take care that their scholars attend to their instructions and make that proficiency which the times demand."

"With this view," he adds, "and in order that neither distance of place, nor distance of circumstances be an excuse to any, we have fixed on such cities as will be found most generally convenient."

He then proceeds to name the cities, which are nine (in Italy), and at the same time specified the subordinate towns in the vicinity of each, the youth of which are to repair to the above schools. At the head of the list stands Pavia, afterwards famous for its great University.

Pope Eugenius II., in a decree published the same year, commands that "care be taken that wherever necessity shall appear teachers shall be appointed, who shall assiduously give instructions on the study of letters and the liberal arts, as also on the holy doctrines of religion."

Referring to an earlier period, Mosheim, the ecclesiastical historian, observes:

"From this time, the Christians applied themselves with more zeal and diligence to the study of philosophy and the liberal arts. The Emperors encouraged this taste for learning and left no means unemployed to excite and maintain a spirit of literary emulation among the professors of Christianity. For this purpose schools were establishad in many cities. Libraries were also erected and men of learning and genius were nobly recompensed by the honors and advantages that were attached to the culture of the sciences and arts." Another writer, Berington, in his "Literary History of the Middle Ages," remarks: "When we turn back to the studies of these men and view the schools which they frequented, the cities which they illustrated by their lectures, the countries through which they travelled in quest of science, the numerous works which proceeded from their pens, the general ardor by which all their pursuits were animated, and which seemed only to relax as the current of life ceased to flow, we shall learn that the Christians of this period were not negligent of the various branches of science; that literature was indebted to their exertions."

The missionaries who accompanied St. Augustine to England, as well as those who had preceded them from Ireland, were the first to diffuse a taste for learning and literature in that country. It is related that "Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, in 668 founded and endowed many schools in England, from which a great number of classical scholars came forth in succeeding ages."

Dr. Collier, a Protestant writer, in his ecclesiastical history, acknowledges that "when the monks were established in England they promoted a general improvement and were very industrious in restoring learning." The great eagerness for the establishment of

schools and for the general education of his people shown by King Alfred the Great, is a subject familiar to every school-boy.

In 1138, the Council of Westminster prohibited the scholastics from exacting payment for the licenses granted to schoolmasters in the towns and villages.

The tenor and spirit of ecclesiastical law and counsel in these ages may be embodied in two significant words and commands, "*Preach*" and "*Teach.*"

"From the earliest centuries," says a writer in the *Contemporary Review*, "it had been a practice with the Christian Church in newly converted countries to erect schools by the side of cathedrals."

The personal history and career of the Popes afford interesting testimony to the educational advantages placed by the Church within the reach of all her children. Many of the most illustrious of the rulers of the Church rose to the Pontifical chair from the humblest ranks and the lowliest employments. The royal road was that of piety and learning.

Sylvester II. was the son of a poor peasant who dwelt in the mountains of Auvergne. Adrian IV., the only English Pope, was the son of a menial employed in the Abbey of St. Albans. Urban IV. was the son of a shoemaker. Nicholas IV. was of an obscure family, and like those already named owed his education to the Benedictines. Benedict XI. was the son of a notary. John XXII. of a shoemaker. Benedict XII. of a miller. Nicholas V., of whom Macaulay said: "Every friend of science should name him with respect," was the son of a physician. "Should I ever possess riches," Nicholas V. had often repeated when he was indigent, "I would expend them in building and in the purchase of books."

Sixtus V. was the son of a peasant of Montalto. The list might be largely extended, but these instances are sufficient for the purpose. "Not one of the august dynasty," testifies a writer in the *Dublin Review*, "has lost sight of the interests of society and the prerogatives of mind; and even in the few instances where they failed in good personally, they encouraged in their official capacity whatsoever things are true and of good name."

The universities founded by the Church constitute a magnificent testimony to her generous patronage of learning. The pages of Hallam, Guizot, Gibbon, Sismondi, Macaulay, Milman, and of many other leading historians, furnish copious and striking admissions and tributes to the number and grandeur of these institutions.

Spain was scarcely emancipated from the Moorish dominion and thraldom when she could boast of possessing *twenty-seven* universities. To name the cities of Salamanca, Valladolid, and Alcala, is to recall the great universities to which these cities chiefly owe

their fame. The celebrity attained by the Universities of Paris, Bologna, Prague, and Padua, and the learning and renown of their professors and scholars, have been the theme of many an eloquent tribute from the pens of historians and essayists.

The origin of the famous English Universities of Oxford and Cambridge is well known, and affords another striking example of the zeal of the Catholic Church to promote higher education. In a speech delivered in the British Parliament bearing on the question of a proposed grant in aid of the Irish College of Maynooth, Macaulay, who warmly supported the grant, thus eloquently acknowledges the Catholic origin and splendid munificence with which these famous universities were endowed in Catholic ages by Catholic kings, queens and bishops:

"When I consider with what magnificence religion and science are endowed in our universities, when I call to mind their long streets of palaces, their trim gardens, their chapels with organs, altar-pieces, and stained windows; when I remember their schools, libraries and galleries of art; when I remember, too, all the solid comforts provided in those places both for instructors and pupils, the stately dwellings of the principals, the commodious apartments of the fellows and scholars; when I remember that the very sizars and servitors are lodged far better than you propose to lodge those priests who are to teach the whole people of Ireland; when I think of the halls, the common rooms, the bowling greens, even the stabling of Oxford and Cambridge—the display of old plate on the tables, the good cheer of the kitchen, the oceans of excellent ale in the buttery, and when I remember from whom all this splendor and plenty are derived; when I remember the faith of Edward III. and Henry VI., of Margaret of Anjou, and Margaret of Richmond, of William of Wykeham, of Archbishop Chichely and Cardinal Wolsey; when I remember what we have taken from the Roman Catholic religion, King's College, New College, my own Trinity College and Christ's Church—and when I look at the miserable Dotheboys Hall we have given them in return—I ask myself if we, and if the Protestant religion, are not disgraced by the comparison?"

These universities are justly the pride of England and the boast and glory of Englishmen; but England may thank and ought forever to hold in enduring remembrance the Catholic founders and benefactors who established and endowed these institutions of learning with a munificence so splendid and enduring.

The attendance or muster roll of students at the English and Continental Universities is another stumbling-block to those who arraign the Church as having been "hostile to education," and demonstrates, moreover, the malicious wantonness of the sneers

and gibes at the "dark ages." In the University of Prague, at the commencement of the 15th century, there were no less than 40,000 students in attendance. The University of Paris is said to have included, during the 12th century, fully one-half the population of the city. In the 13th century Bologna educated 10,000 students in her University, and in the next century the number had increased to 13,000. The figures given as to other European Universities are equally great and amazing. Oxford, in the 14th century, contained no less than 300 colleges and halls, and the number of students is estimated by several writers at no less than 30,000! Though we cannot for obvious reasons go back to the middle ages to show what the Catholic Church did in America for education, we can at all events go back 250 years and point with just pride to the fact that the Catholic Church *founded the first College and established the first University on the American Continent!* It will not be disputed that the *Lavalle University* founded by the Jesuits in Quebec, still in flourishing existence, though under other auspices and management, can claim priority by several years over Cambridge, the oldest college in the United States.

Irish writers refer with justifiable exultation to the Irish schools that flourished in the island during the period immediately following the conversion of the Irish by St. Patrick down to, say, the 11th century, and even English and Continental writers who have studied the subject are scarcely less enthusiastic in alluding to it. "Within a century after the death of St. Patrick," writes Bishop Nicholson, a Protestant authority, "the Irish Seminaries had so increased that most parts of Europe sent their children to be educated there, and drew thence their bishops and teachers."

The *Venerable Bede* testifies to the remarkable and distinguished position held by the Irish in the fifth century, and refers to the multitude of churches and monasteries which existed in the island, and the fame which the Irish schools had even then acquired. Alluding to the ninth century Bede says: "No less than seven thousand students frequented the schools of Armagh alone." The English historian, Camden, remarks how common a thing it is to read in the lives of the English saints that they were "sent to study in Ireland."

Even as late as the eleventh century, Sulgenus, Bishop of St. Davids, is said to have spent ten years studying in the Irish schools, which were then as famous as ever.

Another English writer says: "Whatever exaggeration may have been committed by the national annalists, when they speak of the foreign students who resorted to the Irish schools, it is impossible to doubt that they were eagerly sought by people of

the most distant lands, who, in an age when the rest of Europe was sunk in illiterate barbarism, found in the cloisters of Armagh, Lismore, Clonard, and Clonmacnois, masters of philosophy and sacred science, whose learning had passed into a proverb." Thebaud, in his learned and philosophic work on the *Irish Race*, gives a remarkable enumeration of the monasteries established by the Irish missionaries all over the continent of Europe; and Professor Lecky pays a tribute to the ancient renown of Ireland as the nursery of Christian faith and the focus of European civilization. "I leave it," he says, "to professed antiquarians to discover how far the measure of civilization, which had undoubtedly been attained in Ireland before the English invasion, extended beyond the walls of the monasteries. That civilization enabled Ireland to bear a great and noble part in the conversion of Europe to Christianity. It made it, in one of the darkest periods of the dark ages, a refuge of piety and learning. England owed a great part of her Christianity to the Irish monks who labored among her people before the arrival of Augustine; and Scotland, according to the best authorities, owed her name, her language, and a large part of her population to the long succession of Irish immigrations and conquests between the close of the fifth and the ninth centuries."

The resources in further illustration of this glorious period of Irish history are abundant and readily accessible, and especially as demonstrating the high rank and extended fame of the Irish schools and scholars; but the limit assigned to a single article will not admit of more extended quotations in confirmation.

There is, however, one writer, whose eloquent and enthusiastic testimony to the Irish monks and scholars it would scarcely be pardonable to omit in treating of this subject, the brilliant and erudite Montalembert. "It has been said, and cannot be sufficiently repeated," he says, in a remarkable chapter in his *Monks of the West*, "that Ireland was then regarded by all Christian Europe as the principal centre of knowledge and piety. In the shelter of her numberless monasteries a crowd of missionaries, doctors, and preachers were educated for the service of the Church and the propagation of the faith in all Christian countries. A vast and continuous development of literary and religious effort is there apparent superior to anything that could be seen in any other country in Europe. Certain arts were successfully cultivated. The classic languages, not only Latin, but Greek, were cultivated, spoken, and written, with a sort of passionate pedantry which shows at least how powerful was the sway of intellectual influence over these ardent souls. Their mania for Greek was carried so far that they wrote the Latin of the Church in Hellenic characters.

"And in Ireland, more than anywhere else, each monastery was

a school, and each school a workshop of transcription, from which day by day issued new copies of the Holy Scriptures and the Fathers of the primitive Church, copies which were dispersed through all Europe, and which are still to be found in the Continental libraries. They may easily be recognized by the original and elegant character of their Irish writing, as also by the use of the alphabet common to all the Celtic races, and afterwards employed by the Anglo-Saxons, but to which in our own day the Irish alone have remained faithful.

"Columbkille had given an example of this unwearied labor to the monastic scribes. His example was continually followed in the Irish cloisters, where the monks did not merely limit themselves to the transcription of the Holy Scriptures, but reproduced also Greek and Latin authors, sometimes in Celtic character, with gloss and commentary in Irish, like that *Horace* which modern learning has discovered in the library of Berne. These marvellous MSS., illuminated with incomparable ability and patience, excited five hundred years later the declamatory enthusiasm of the great enemy of Ireland, the Anglo-Norman, Gerald De Barry, and still attracts the attention of archæologists and philologists of the highest fame."

In another chapter in the same work the eloquent Frenchman says:

"Still more striking than the intellectual development of which the Irish monasteries were at the time the centre, is the prodigious activity displayed by the Irish monks in extending and multiplying themselves over all the countries of Europe;—here to create new schools and sanctuaries among nations already evangelized,—there to carry the light of the gospel at the peril of their lives to countries that were still pagan.

"The monasteries which gradually covered the soil of Ireland were the hostelries of a foreign emigration. Unlike the ancient Druidical colleges they were open to all, the poor and the rich, the slave as well as the freeman, the child and the old man had free access and paid nothing. It was not then only to the natives of Ireland that the Irish monasteries confined the benefit of their knowledge, and of literary and religious education.

"They opened their doors with admirable generosity to strangers of every country and of every condition; above all to those who came from the neighboring island, England, some to end their lives in an Irish cloister, some to go from house to house in search of books, and masters capable of explaining those books.

"The Irish monks received with kindness guests so greedy of instruction, and gave them both books and masters—the food of the body and the food of the soul without demanding any recom-

pense. The Anglo-Saxons, who were afterwards to repay this teaching with ingratitude so cruel, were of all nations the one which derived the most profit from it.

"From the seventh to the eleventh centuries English students flocked into Ireland, and for four hundred years the monastic schools of the island maintained the great reputation which brought so many successive generations to dip deeply there into the living waters of knowledge and faith."

Here then we have the irrefutable testimony to the fact that when Ireland was most devotedly Catholic, she was at the same time the most renowned as an educational centre. Ireland then possessed great schools, and scholars worthy of her schools.

Learning perished in Ireland only when civil wars had scourged and foreign invasions had ravaged and desolated the island.

It was the destructive sword and the devastating torch of the *Northmen* in repeated raids that swept away and ravaged in ruthless succession church, monastery, and school, and paralyzed the energies which would have restored them; and the vandalism and iron rule of the English invader completed their extinction. Since then we know how effectually penal laws and proscriptive measures supplemented the wrathful work commenced by the destroying Dane, and continued and completed by their Norman and English successors.

When we come to the period of the important discovery of the art of printing we are again reminded how unworthily a false outcry against the Church obtains credit and currency before the public. It might be inferred from all that has been said and written on the subject—nay, it is sometimes boldly charged that the Catholic Church contrived in some occult way or manner to prevent and retard this valuable discovery. It is true, though the fact is conveniently ignored or skipped over, that the art of printing was discovered and in use nearly one hundred years before the period of the so-called "Reformation;" and the Catholic Church was prompt to utilize its services and to encourage and promote its use.

It was the Popes who assisted the first printers, the workmen of Faust and Schaeffer, on their removal to Rome. The first printing press set up in Paris was at the *Sorbonne*. The first to patronize printing in England was Thomas Milling, Archbishop of Westminster, in which Abbey Caxton established his printing office.

The earliest printing done in Italy was at the monastery of St. Scholastica Subiaco, the productions of which are sought after by bibliopolists and antiquarians on account of the remarkable beauty of the printing.

In 1474 the Augustinian monks printed books at their monas-

tery in Rhingau. In 1480 a printing press was set up in the English Abbey of St. Albans, and another in the Abbey of Tavistock.

The dates of the early printed editions of the Bible demonstrate the absurdity of the claim put forward by Protestant writers that the "Reformers" were the first to translate the Sacred Scriptures and render them accessible to Christian readers.

Lying books, coarse cartoons and vulgar pictures are made the convenient medium to slander and calumniate the monks of the middle ages, whose lives have been maliciously distorted, and whose works are almost uniformly belittled and ridiculed.

Lazy monks, forsooth! We are indebted to the Catholic Church and to the zeal and industry of the monks of the middle ages for all that we possess of ancient and classic literature, and, of course, also for the preservation and multiplication of the Holy Scriptures. These greatly maligned men were the teachers and schoolmasters of their time; they were the artists, authors, architects, agriculturists, builders, colonizers, scientists, and inventors in every age and country. "These monks," says Frederic Ozanam, "who spent six hours in the choir, transcribed in their cells the histories and even the poets of Greece and Rome, and bequeathed to the middle ages the most valuable writings of antiquity."

Trace most of the famous discoveries and inventions of the middle ages, and even in the later times, and we shall most likely find that they were due to the genius and the industry of the "lazy monk." The monks were pioneers even in the principles that lie at the foundation of our modern popular free governments.

The essential and vital doctrines and maxims in the American Constitution and "Declaration of Independence," may be found embodied in the Constitution of the Benedictine and other religious orders.

The vaunted rights and liberties which have been transmitted through the English Common Law, if traced back to the source from which they emanated, will be found almost invariably to have been inspired or placed there by the forgotten monks.

The palladium of English liberty, the vaunted *Magna Charta*, was the achievement and work of a Catholic bishop.

"But for the monks of the middle ages," says Mrs. Jameson, "the light of liberty, literature, and science had been forever extinguished; and for six centuries there existed for the thoughtful, the gentle, the inquiring, the devout spirit, no peace, no security, no home, but the cloister.

"There learning trimmed her lamp; there contemplation 'preened her wings;' there the traditions of art, preserved from age to age by lonely, studious men, kept alive in form and color the idea of a beauty beyond that of earth—of a might beyond that of the spear

and shield, of a divine sympathy with suffering humanity. To this we may add another and a stronger claim to our respect and moral sympathy,—the protection and the better education given to woman in those early communities; the venerable and distinguished rank assigned to them, when as governesses of orders they became in a manner dignitaries of the Church; the introduction of their beautiful and saintly effigies, clothed with all the insignia of sanctity and authority, into the decoration of places of worship and books of devotion, did more, perhaps, for the general cause of womanhood than all the boasted institutions of chivalry."

"Every monastery," says Mr. Lecky in his *History of European Rationalism*, "became a centre from which charity radiated. By the monks the nobles were overawed, the poor protected, the sick tended, travellers sheltered, prisoners ransomed, the remotest spheres of suffering explored." "The Catholic Church," writes Mr. Emerson, "had been for centuries the democratic principle in Europe," and "Christianity lived by the love of the people."

An English writer, O'Dell T. Hill, in a notable work, *English Monasticism*, pp. 514–15, pays the following tribute to the monks:

"But far away from the Castle there arose another building; massive, solid, and strong, not frowning with battlemented towers, nor isolated by broad moats, but with open gates and a hearty welcome to all comers, stood the Monastery, where lay the hope of humanity as in a safe asylum. Behind its walls was the church, and clustered around it the dwelling-places of those who had left the world, and devoted their lives to the service of that Church, and the salvation of their souls.

"Far and near in its vicinity the land bore witness to assiduous culture and diligent care, bearing on its fertile bosom the harvest hope of those who had labored, which the heavens watered, the sun smiled upon, and the winds played over, until the heart of man rejoiced, and all nature was big with promise of increase.

"This was the refuge to which religion and art had fled. In the quiet seclusion of its cloisters, science labored at its problems and perpetuated its results, uncheered by applause, and stimulated only by the pure love of the pursuit. Art toiled in the Church, and whole generations of busy fingers worked patiently at the decoration of the temple of the Most High.

"The pale, thoughtful monk, upon whose brow genius had set her mark, wandered into the calm retirement of the library, threw back his cowl, buried himself in the study of philosophy, history, or divinity, and transferred his thoughts to vellum, which was to moulder and waste in darkness and obscurity, like himself in his lonely monk's grave, and be read only when the spot where he

labored should be a heap of ruins, and his very name a controversy amongst scholars.

"We should never lose sight of the truth, that in this building, when the world was given up to violence and darkness, was garnered the hope of humanity; and these men who dwelt there in contemplation and obscurity were its faithful guardians; and this was more particularly the case with that great Order to which Glastonbury belonged.

"The Benedictines were the depositaries of learning and the arts; they gathered books together, and reproduced them in the silence of their cells, and they preserved in this way not only the volumes of Sacred Writ, but many of the works of classic lore. They started Gothic architecture—that matchless union of nature with art; they alone had the secrets of chemistry and medical science; they invented many colors; they were the first architects, artists, glass-stainers, carvers and mosaic workers in mediæval times. They were the original illuminators of manuscripts, and the first transcribers of books; in fine, they were the writers, thinkers, and workers of a dark age, who wrote for no applause, thought with no encouragement, and worked for no reward.

"Their power, too, waxed mighty; kings trembled before their denunciations of tyranny, and in the hour of danger fled to their altars for safety; and it was an English king who made a pilgrimage to their shrines, and prostrate at the feet of five Benedictine monks, bared his back, and submitted himself to be scourged as a panacea for his crimes."

As in the case of the public schools, we have seen it more than once gravely stated that "Public Libraries" originated in the United States, and it has been seriously asserted that the first free circulating library was established in New England within this century?

Public libraries were in existence prior to the discovery of America by Columbus, long before the *Pilgrim Fathers* landed at Plymouth, and flourished centuries before the invention of printing!

The innumerable monastic libraries of the middle ages, and the general use made of them, may be cited as satisfactory, if not conclusive testimony on this point.

Students and scholars were not only given free access to the books, they were likewise permitted to carry the books away for use and study at home.

When in several abbeys in France the practice of loaning books had been discontinued, probably on account of the abuse made of the privilege, the Council of Paris, held in 1212, ordered the resumption of what was declared to be an "ancient custom," adding

that, "the lending of books may be regarded as among the most eminent works of mercy."

Modern critics remark that the great number of books published in the middle ages establishes the assurance of a great multitude of readers, and Schlegel asserts that "from the time of Charlemagne, MSS. were multiplied in Europe with more profusion than they had been in the most polished times of antiquity, so that the writings of Greece and Rome were studied in remote and desolate regions, to which, if it had not been for the efforts of the Church to promote learning, their fame would have never reached."

When we consider how tedious was the task involved in transcribing and copying, and the labor and industry involved in the multiplication of books and manuscripts, as well as the extraordinary patience and ingenuity required to produce even a single book; and when we take into account the prodigious number that were thus produced for the use of the churches, monasteries, universities, and the libraries of Europe, we cannot but marvel at the extent and magnitude of the labor performed by the patient and intelligent scribes of the middle ages—the "lazy monks." In spite of all the causes and agencies that have conspired to promote the destruction of these fragile and perishable treasures, how vast is the accumulation of ancient books and writings still preserved to us in their original form and beauty!

There are upwards of 80,000 MSS. in the *Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris; 100,000 in the library of the British Museum; 20,000 in the Royal Library, Munich; 30,000 in the Bodleian Library, Oxford; 25,000 in the Vatican Library; besides the innumerable great collections in the various monasteries and the public and private libraries in Italy and throughout the continent. An account lately appeared in the public journals, of the discovery of an extensive collection of valuable Irish MSS. brought to light in the Royal Library, Copenhagen, not improbably part of the spoil carried away from Ireland by the Danish invaders! The ravages and destruction caused by civil wars and invasions during which, unhappily, the monastery and the school were too often the special objects of destructive vengeance, would account in part for the loss of many valuable collections of books; and when to this cause we add the losses by fire, natural decay, and other like agencies, we may well marvel that so many of these literary treasures are preserved to our day. The most fatal and destructive agency of all, undoubtedly, was the suppression of the religious orders and the confiscation of the monasteries and convents, where these literary treasures of the middle ages were chiefly collected and preserved.

An incredible number of MSS. and books were destroyed in England.

"Whole libraries," says a writer, "were made waste paper of, or consumed for the vilest uses."

The splendid Abbey of Malmesbury, which possessed some of the finest MSS. in the kingdom, was "ransacked, and its treasures either burnt or sold to serve the commonest purposes of life."

"One, among the misfortunes consequent upon the suppression of the monasteries," says Dr. Collier, "was an ignorant destruction of many valuable books; many noble libraries were destroyed, to a great public scandal, and an irreparable loss to learning." Bale, Bishop of Ossory, although an enemy to the monks, lamented with the sorrow of a scholar the destruction of the English libraries caused by the wanton ignorance of the "Reformed" Commissioners. There would have been less occasion for reproach, he says, in his quaint old English, "*if only there had been in every shrine of England but one Solemne lybrary to the preservacyon of those noble works . . . . but to destroye all without consideracyon is and wyll be unto England for ever a most horrible infamy among the grave senyors of other nations.*"

Another writer mourns that the rarest books and the most precious MSS. were often turned to the vilest uses; the jewels and clasps torn off, whilst the books themselves were sold for waste paper; servants employed them to scour candlesticks, and even to rub their boots, and we are told of a tradesman who bought the contents of two noble libraries for "40 shillings," and had been using them for nearly two years for waste paper, and "had enough yet left to last him many years more."

The number and variety of the religious orders and congregations in the Catholic Church devoted to the duty of teaching in colleges, seminaries, and schools in every part of the world, constitutes, perhaps, the most striking evidence of the zeal and solicitude of the Church to promote and foster education, and to provide in the most effective manner for the training of her children. The efficiency and superior qualifications of these *religious* are universally acknowledged.

No parallel can be found for the self-devotedness of the members of these innumerable communities of men and women who consecrate their lives and their talents to this exalted mission. They supply learned Jesuits as professors for universities and colleges in the domain of higher studies; pious and talented Christian brothers for the parochial schools; and accomplished and elegantly trained nuns for the academies and female schools.

This subject alone would afford abundant material for an independent sketch, and cannot without injustice be considered in the

course of the present notice. We may be permitted to thus scantily refer to it in passing as suggesting and illustrating the resources of the Church, and her deep appreciation of the importance of providing for the educational wants of the young.

The Catholic Church has been from the beginning the earnest, constant and devoted foster mother of education; the patron of schools and colleges; the creator of libraries, the consistent friend of science and learning. These facts may be traced in her early history, they appear in the lives of her Pontiffs and Bishops; in the decrees of Councils and Synods; in the laws and enactments of Catholic kings and parliaments; in the zeal and services of the religious orders, and by the concurring testimony of truthful history. They are demonstrated in the schools established through her encouragement, and in the colleges and universities founded and maintained by her bounty and munificent patronage. The facts are triumphantly supported and vindicated by her Catholic children throughout all ages and in every land, who have given abounding proofs and shining testimony in the talents nourished by her teaching, and the genius which developed and matured under her stimulus and generous encouragement.

HOW CHURCH HISTORY IS WRITTEN.

History of the Christian Church. By Philip Schaff. A new edition, thoroughly revised and enlarged. Vol. I. Apostolic Christianity, A. D. 1–100. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1882. Large octavo, pp. 871.

IT must strike not only the Catholic, but even an impartial outsider, that there is something unreasonable, if not approaching the ludicrous, in the modern fashion of writing church history, as proposed in theory and carried out in practice by not a few of those who outside of the Catholic Church yet retain the Christian name. The writer of English or other profane history, no matter how strong his adherence to Protestantism, will never lose sight of the fact that he is writing the history of a commonwealth or state, one in its government, fundamental laws and institutions, one, too, in its people, no matter from what coalescence of races that unity may have arisen. It may be his duty to mention periods of domestic strife, transient outbreaks of rebellion or usurpation, just as he would not omit foreign wars, crimes, great calamities, or changes of legislation brought about by changed times; but he never forgets his main purpose, which is to write the history of one state, one people. It never occurs to him to identify rebels, usurpers, or other disturbers of the public peace with legitimate authority. But what he would not venture to do when writing the profane annals of an earthly state, he will do boldly, without any seeming consciousness of wrong, when sitting down to unfold the history of Christ's Church, God's kingdom upon earth.

The earliest and most venerable record of this kingdom is to be found in the inspired scriptures of the New Testament. And common propriety would suggest that they should be taken as model and guide by any one who sets about writing the history of God's kingdom. He might at least take the pains of learning from them what is the constitution and fundamental law of that Christian Church whose history and vicissitudes he undertakes to describe.

If there be any point of doctrine laid down with unmistakable clearness in the New Testament, it is the unity of the Church as to her belief, government, and the visible communion of her members in the profession of the same faith and the enjoyment of the same worship and sacraments. As there is but one Shepherd, there can be but one fold; as there is but one Lord, there can be but one faith, one baptism (Jo. x. 16; Eph. iv. 5). Nor is this

unity of belief and communion to be something vague, intangible, or invisible. Christ's people must form one body as well as one spirit. In one spirit we are baptized into one body. The one life-giving bread of the Eucharist, of which we all partake, makes us one body, though we be many (Eph. iv. 4; Coloss. iii. 15; 1 Cor. xii. 13, x. 17). All Christians must be "of one mind," "of one accord," not only in the bond of charity, but also in outward profession of the same faith, so that "all speak the same thing" (Phil. ii. 2; 1 Cor. i. 10). Heretics, that is those who presume to set themselves up against the teaching of Christ's Church, are to be warned, and if they remain obstinate are to be avoided, for they sin deliberately and so stand self-condemned. They are not to be allowed into Christian houses nor receive from us friendly greeting, lest we become partakers of their wickedness (Tit. iii. 10; 2 Jo. 10, 11).

But why should we quote further from the king's counsellors, and heralds, when we have the express words of the Divine Founder of this kingdom? In His prayer (Jo. xvii. 20–23), uttered on the eve of shedding His precious blood, that was to be the seal of the New Covenant, He beseeches His Father that not only the princes and rulers of His Church, but all who are hereafter to believe in Him may be one in faith as He and the Father are one. And he prays further, that this unity of belief may be to the world a standing proof of His divine mission and the divine origin of the kingdom He was to establish. "That the world may know that Thou hast sent Me" (ibid.). Our Lord, therefore, prayed for two things, first, that unity of faith might be the perpetual prerogative of His Church, and secondly, that this unity of faith should be an unfailing mark to distinguish true from false Christianity, in other words to know Christ's work from that of Anti-christ, who would one day seek its ruin under pretence of reforming and improving it.[1] Who that has a spark of Christian reverence can endure the thought that these last words of earnest supplication were doomed to fall away from the loving Father's ears unheard or unheeded, and that unity of faith, instead of becoming the glorious prerogative of His Church forever, was destined one day to become the shameful token of unenlightened, effete Christianity? Such a thought, disguise it as one will, is simply rank blasphemy. And if right-minded men, who profess to read and study their Bible, but alas! do not, would only read and ponder these words of Christ, they would shudder at the thought of thus dishonoring Him who bought them. And if they read a little further in the

[1] This is the way in which Our Lord's Prayer is explained by all Protestant commentators, who yet retain reverence for the Christianity taught in the Gospel. See Westcott's Notes on St. John's Gospel in Canon Cook's "Holy Bible." New York (Scribner's Sons), 1880, pp. 246–47.

same Gospel they would discover that Our Lord knew full well that He would be heard by His Father. "Father, I give Thee thanks that Thou hast heard me, and I know that Thou hearest me always" (Jo. xi. 41, 42).

The earlier Protestant historians—those say, who lived for nearly two centuries after the Reformation—exhibited in their writings far more of the principle and spirit, without which Christianity becomes inconceivable or absurd. Knowing well that Christ had founded a Church and spread it through the world by means of His apostles, they did their best to identify Protestantism with the Church that He had built, and that His chosen Twelve had preached to the Jewish and Gentile world. To do this was no easy task, but they labored at it in spite of all difficulties, and we may well suppose with not a few misgivings. Again, when they had to speak of those early heresies that rejected or sought to undermine the chief mysteries of revealed teaching, they would denounce such blasphemies with a hearty vehemence that sufficiently attested the reverence they had retained for what they deemed the most important truths of the Bible. The spirit of private judgment, however, proved always and necessarily some drawback, for this is a hidden magical link that unites all heresies, no matter how different, by bonds of sympathy. And in the case of such heretics as Aerius, Helvidius, and Vigilantius, it would be hard to expect that a Protestant historian should denounce them as freely as he would Manes, Arius, or Macedonius, or condemn his own errors in the person of any heresiarch however ancient.

But the spirit of doubt and denial that lay at the bottom of the sixteenth century revolt against Church authority had to run its logical course. And more than a century and a half has passed since the seeds of rationalism, scattered more or less covertly through the many works of the Reformer of Wittemberg, seem to have been suddenly developed in the German mind. They had been ripening all the while, as our Catholic theologians had foretold long before. Yet, when they burst out into full growth and vigorous life, Protestant orthodoxy appeared shocked and pained as if by some unforeseen catastrophe. But the shock, real or affected, was not of long duration. It soon subsided into indifference. And this ere long was followed by acquiescence and adhesion. Rationalism became not only the fashion, but the recognized badge, as it were, of culture and science, while orthodoxy of the old pattern was derided and decried as another name for ignorance or blind adherence to superstitions that had had their day, but could never return to enchain the enlightened human mind.

It was not only the doctrines of the sacred books that were

denied, but the books themselves and their divine origin. Then was fully justified the warning voice that had been uttered centuries before by our Catholic forefathers in the faith. They had said to those who in the sixteenth century had raised the false cry of Gospel freedom, "You have taken to yourselves the liberty of picking and choosing (as your very name ἁιρεσις implies) whatever doctrines you prefer out of the inspired books and rejecting the rest. Your children will follow in your footsteps and do yet worse. They will pick and choose out of the sacred volume what books they like and discard the rest." And the children have done and continue to do it. Having first declared that the volume has no sacred character, they condescend to allow the genuineness of such books as will stand the test of their critical investigation (so they call it); the others they reject in whole or part as the coinage of some Pseudo-Isaias, Pseudo-Paul, Pseudo-Peter, and the like. And it is with the aid of these arbitrary methods they consider themselves best qualified to discuss and decide on any and every Biblical question, theological doctrine, and the history of the early Church.

And to speak more particularly of the last-mentioned subject, their usual style of dealing with it would be amusing were it not so wicked and too often blasphemous. The history of the Church in its earliest period has for its principal sources the writings of the Apostles themselves, and of those who are called "Apostolic Fathers," viz., Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, and others. It is simply astonishing to see how rationalistic "critics" handle these writers; with what bold presumption they decide on their thoughts and motives as well as their words; how they retain or reject whatever they please, guided seemingly by no law but their own caprice. Self-conceited, boastful blunderers, who could mistake Meinhold's fiction,[1] composed in our own day, for an historical

[1] Rev. Dr. Meinhold, an orthodox Lutheran minister of Pomerania, was a "hearty hater" of all the Rationalism of our day. He had a thorough contempt for the lofty criticism of the Tübingen school, believing it to be no scholarship at all, but windy pretence based on a love of novelty, rather than hatred of Christianity. He determined to puncture these wind-bags, and to do so, offered them as a bait his charming novel "die Bernsteinhexe" (the Amber Witch), remarkably well translated into English some forty years ago by Lady Duff Gordon. He pretended that it was an old chronicle which he had discovered in some Pomeranian archives. And the perfect way in which he imitated the German style and language of these centuries ago, lent color to his innocent artifice. The Tübingen school, for whom he had laid the trap, examined his book. Men who could tell every spurious or genuine verse in Matthew, Mark, Peter, Paul and John, applied their critical lens to the "Amber Witch," and after erudite examination decided that it was a genuine chronicle of the fifteenth century. The journalists and reviewers, who were only ordinary mortals, all suspected that he had only had recourse to the common artifice of romancers, like Walter Scott, Manzoni, and others. Meinhold himself kept quiet, laughing in secret over the stupidity and self-conceit of the Tübingen critics. It was only when he was formally questioned by

chronicle of three hundred years ago, can, *stantes pede in uno*, point out to you, if you will only take their word for it, every chapter, page, paragraph, and even single verse that is genuine, spurious, or interpolated in the writings of St. Paul, St. Peter, St. Clement, St. Ignatius, and the other sources on which depends the history of primitive Christianity.

By these remarks, which we have prefixed to an examination of Dr. Schaff's Church History, we do not intend to prejudge his book nor hold it up for the condemnation of our readers as the work of a professed rationalist. Dr. Schaff would be the last man to acknowledge himself such. But a rationalist he certainly is, if we are to judge him not by detached passages (written in a Christian sense), but by the whole tenor of his book. His rationalism may be more timid, more cautious, more refined than that of the Baurs and the Tübingen school. But there is nothing to prevent rationalism from having its degrees, its less or more advanced stages, than positivism or any other system that is outside of Christianity. The drift of his book is eminently rationalistic, and any one of his disciples, any one who intends to learn from it as from a text-book—who does not skim it over superficially, but studies or even reads it with some degree of careful attention and accepts its teachings as truth—will soon find himself in a wretched state of doubt or, worse still, of dogmatism, which, whatever name it may assume, cannot honestly pretend to be called Christian. Unfortunately, the Protestant mind of the whole country is slowly but surely finding its way to the abyss of German rationalism, and many are closer to it than they would care to acknowledge. This happens principally in what are called our "seats of learning," colleges, theological seminaries, and the like. Some few even in the ministry speak out quite freely, and their frankness does them some credit. Others are more cautious,[1] and with good reason. There yet lingers a good deal of old-fashioned Protestantism in this country which cannot be insulted with impunity. It retains reverence for God, His only begotten Son, His Apostles and their inspired writings. It shudders, as just Christian feeling demands,

a letter from King John of Saxony, that he came out and acknowledged that every line and word of the romance was his from beginning to end. What did the infallible professors of Tübingen do? They came out with a proclamation declaring that they were right in their decision, and that Meinhold must have deceived the public.

[1] It is not more than a year since an Episcopal minister of New York declared publicly that many Protestant ministers did not hold the religious opinions which they habitually gave out from the pulpit, but lacked the courage to speak out what they thought. He referred, evidently, to those who spoke like Christians, while believing like rationalists. This candid acknowledgment (for, doubtless, he included himself in the number) raised a storm of indignant denial in many parts of the country, especially from the religious press, whose editors must have known the truth of the assertion.

at the thought of allowing the Holy Books of the Old or New Law to be treated as the work of ignorant or designing men, the outcome of a rude, imperfect religion, and only a little better, if at all, than the writings of Buddha or Confucius.

This class of Protestants must be gently dealt with. Their prejudices, as these Neologists consider them (and would so call them if they dared), must not be abruptly shocked, but must be delicately handled. The false teachers even seek to propitiate the unthinking crowd by occasional outbursts of sturdy Protestantism. And we all know how efficacious are a few timely tirades against Popery in lulling to unsuspecting repose the minds of most hearers and readers, and giving the safest assurance of the orthodoxy of the preacher or writer.

We regret that Dr. Schaff—in what all must acknowledge to be a learned and important work—should have laid himself open to the suspicion of having stooped to this petty artifice. It will be hard for any enlightened, impartial reader to resist the suggestion that his foul, reckless and (for an historian) undignified abuse of everything Catholic is only a shabby device to maintain his own character for orthodoxy and turn away attention from the rationalistic poison of his book. Or, to be more charitable, perhaps it is the intensity of his hatred to Rome that impels him unconsciously to break out into abuse of Rome and all that belongs to her, to vilify—and we are ashamed to say it—to falsify her creed. Others perhaps may suspect another motive. They will remember that years ago Dr. Schaff was accused of Romanizing tendencies. There was not a particle of ground for the accusation, unless perhaps that in waging war with the Catholic Church he abstained from the fierce, coarse language current amongst the sects. Time has shown that there never was any danger of his leaving the Protestant fold. But the memory of the charge haunts him still. It is a sore yet rankling within him; and he unwisely *vulnera cruda retractat*, by letting slip no occasion of flinging off this hated reproach. And how does he do it? By stooping to imitate the very men who accused him of being a Cryto-Papist in the use of ugly language against Rome! It is a pity that a man of his scholarly attainments and well-established reputation could find no better, more dignified way of repelling this or any other charge.

Forgetting, however, for the moment Dr. Schaff's anti-Catholic and Rationalistic bias, it is but fair to state that he has here and there passages breathing a truly Christian spirit, to which no Catholic can take exception, but must on the contrary award them his unqualified sympathy and admiration. There are other passages, too, which no Protestant can read without accepting him as a thorough exponent of most orthodox, old-fashioned, evangelical

Protestantism. But such detached passages are calculated to do harm and have done it. They have caught the eye and blinded the mental vision of his reviewers. For in them all we have found no word of condemnation, not even of warning, but one universal chorus of rapturous praise. The only exception was a Lutheran periodical, which ventured faintly to blame the author's lack of due reverence for Luther. But it had no eyes to detect his want of reverence for the Apostles and the Holy Ghost who inspired them.

Apart from all religious considerations, and viewing the work merely from a literary standpoint, it is simple justice to say that Dr. Schaff's history is well written. Though he was born in Germany and spent his youth there, his correct and judicious use of our language would prevent any reader from suspecting that English was not his native tongue. His book is, besides, replete with erudition, some of which will be new to most American readers. And the number of authors whom he quotes is sufficient proof of the patient, toilsome research that he has brought to the composition of his work.

By the very motto the author has chosen for his book and inscribed on its title-page, he sufficiently shows what is his conception of Christ's Christian Church. His reason for adopting it is this: "The secular historian should be filled with universal human sympathy, the church historian with universal Christian sympathy. The motto of the former is: *Homo sum; nihil humani a me alienum puto;*[1] the motto of the latter: *Christianus sum; nihil Christiani a me alienum puto*" (p. 25). This frame of mind in the Church historian he describes in the same paragraph as "a sound moral and religious, that is, a truly Christian spirit." He explains himself more openly on p. 26: "There is a common Christianity in the Church as well as a common humanity in the world which no Christian can disregard with impunity. Christ is the divine harmony of all the discordant human creeds and sects. It is the duty and the privilege of the historian to trace the image of Christ in the various physiognomies of His disciples and to act as a mediator between the different sections of His Kingdom." Christ's Church, therefore, is to be considered as made up of all those who justly or unjustly call themselves Christians. And all who call Him Master, no matter how discordant or contradictory the lessons they have learned from Him, are His disciples. This would only prove (*sit venia verbo*), that He is not a competent Teacher. Is not

[1] This is the celebrated line of Terence, praised by Cicero, Seneca, Saints Ambrose and Augustine, and other Holy Fathers and mediæval writers, and which, when first uttered, is said to have elicited applause from the whole theatre. We think Dr. S. should have let the famous line remain just as the poet wrote it:

Homo sum: humani nihil a me alienum puto.

this horrible to Christian ears? Yet it is the logical sequence of the author's theory. And if, as He promised, He is forever to abide with His Church, made up of jarring creeds and discordant sects, then He can only abide with her as a patron and encourager, if not an actual teacher of error. But is this the Bible conception of the Church in the Old or New Covenant? Was the old Church at any time made up of Jews, Jeroboamites, and Samaritans? or did our Saviour deceive the Samaritan woman when He told her (Jo. iv. 22) that salvation, and therefore the true way of worshipping God, as taught by Himself, belonged exclusively to the Jews: *Salus ex Judæis est?* The very fact that the Jews would not hold social, much less religious, communion with the Samaritans (ib. v. 8), shows plainly that the latter were considered to be outside of the Jewish Church. In the Church of the New Testament the lines are yet more strictly drawn. Heretics, as we have seen from St. Paul and St. John, are to be shut out by true Christians from religious communion, and even from social intercourse, where this may endanger faith. According to the beloved Apostle, heretics are not in the Church; and their going out of it is the best proof that in heart and soul they never belonged to it. "They went out from us, but they were not of us. For if they had been of us they would, no doubt, have continued with us" (I. John ii. 19). And we have seen before that, according to our Saviour's prayer (Jo. xvii.), unity of faith was to be the distinctive mark, not only of the Apostles and disciples, whom the Father gave immediately into His hands, but of all who were to believe in Him down to the end of the world.

The Church historian has no more right to ignore or pervert this New Testament characteristic of Christ's earthly kingdom than has the Church theologian. And what is true of her faith must also be true of her government. If she is an organized body—and the wisdom and power of her Divine Founder call for nothing else—she must be one and unchanging in her government. Nor can the historian lose sight of this without being unfaithful to his duty, and insinuating dogmatic error under cover of historical development. Yet Dr. Schaff gives this advice (p. 9), and has no objection to allow his readers to suppose that Papal, Presbyterial, and Congregational governments are mere outward forms of Church polity, either simply adiaphorous or nothing more than the outgrowth of human caprice or human ambition. Elsewhere, indeed (p. 486), he makes no secret of his own opinion, which is that in the Apostolic times there was no distinction between clergy and laity. And with that lofty superciliousness, which is the distinguishing trait of all Rationalists, even of the milder type, as if he alone possessed the key of Scriptural knowledge, he boldly de-

cides (p. 263) against all commentators, Catholic and non-Catholic, of the last eighteen centuries, that by the word κληρων (clergy, I. Pet. v. 3), St. Peter meant not *clergy*, but *laity*, viz., "the Christian people." The New Testament cannot be expected to furnish its own commentary, but a sufficient help to its meaning (apart from Church authority) may be found in the words and actions of those Apostolic Fathers who were educated in the school of the Apostles, and who represented and perpetuated their teaching. St. Ignatius, a disciple of St. John, speaks clearly enough of the difference between bishops, priests, and laity. And St. Clement, a Roman disciple of St. Peter, in a solemn document, written on behalf of the Church of Rome to the Church of Corinth, says plainly that the chief priest (bishop or αρχιερευς) has his duties assigned him; as to the priests (τοις ιερευσιν) is also allotted their proper place, and to the Levites (deacons) their own ministry; while the layman (ὁ λαικὸς) is bound by the precepts that regard the laity.[1] St. Polycarp, too, in his letter to the Philippians (cap. v.), mentions deacons and priests as distinct from the laity.[2]

If there be any doctrine that has come down from Apostolic times to our own consecrated by the belief and reverence of all Christians, and holding its own unimpaired by quarrels over other doctrines, it is the inspiration of the books of the Old and New Testament. The New Testament cannot be supposed to vouch directly[3] for its own inspiration. But this has been sufficiently established by the teaching of the Apostles and the tradition of the Church. St. Paul calls all Scripture divinely inspired (θεόπνευστος, II. Tim. iii. 16); and St. Peter adds, that its authors were holy men of God, who spoke inspired or moved by the Holy Ghost (ὕπὸ Πνεύματος αγιου φερόμενοι, II. Pet. i. 21). Catholic and Protestant alike acknowledge this truth, and to deny it is virtually to overthrow Christianity. Dr. Schaff amuses his readers by talking in general terms of inspiration, as if he held the orthodox view of it. He speaks (p. 571) of the New Testament books as "written under the special influence and direction of the Holy Spirit;" but when he comes to speak in detail of the "holy men of God," whom Catholics and orthodox Protestants believe to have been the chosen

[1] See *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera* (by Gebhart and Harnack), Lipsiae, 1876, vol. i., pp. 65, 66. The boastful arrogance of these two rationalistic editors is only matched by their contempt for Latin grammar and syntax. They make *perlustratus* a deponent participle (p. lxxvi.), and *regnatus* the equivalent of the passive participle "governed." "Ecclesia cui adscriptus erat auctor nondum *per unum Episcopum regnata* esse videtur." And these are the men who bow down before Theodore Mommsen, and join him in casting discredit on the classical scholars of Italy.

[2] Ibid., vol. ii., p. 120. If he does not mention the bishop, it may be easily explained by the possibility that the see was then vacant. Zahn's supposition that no bishops yet existed is quite gratuitous. The main point is the distinction between clergy and laity.

[3] Indirectly St. Paul's Epistles are vouched for as Scripture by St. Peter (II. Pet. iii. 16).

channels of God's revelation, he shows the cloven foot of Rationalism. He hints, when he gets the chance (p. 608), that inspiration, in its true sense, is incompatible with "the personal agency and individual peculiarities of the sacred authors, and the exercise of their natural faculties in writing." He seems inclined to fasten on Catholics and orthodox Protestant Christians a belief in this incompatibility, and regards it as an attempt on their part "to cut the Gordian knot," which is wholly of his own making. As far as the Catholic Church is concerned, we can only say that no such idea was ever entertained by her divines. From the great St. Jerome, who, centuries ago, studiously noted the difference in style between the rustic Amos and the courtly Isaias, down to the humblest theological plodder of our day, every one acknowledges, without hesitation, that difference of style or mental peculiarities, diligence, and skill in the searching out and making use of records, written or unwritten, are by no means incompatible with the Catholic theory of inspiration. Does Dr. Schaff imagine that no Catholic Father or theologian has ever read St. Luke's prologue to his Gospel, and that his able pen was needed to bring out its true significance?

We insist that with or notwithstanding a man's peculiarities of style, temperament, accurate research, and preparation, he may be chosen to be the channel of communication between God and man; and, when he is so chosen, he becomes the mouthpiece of God, revealing the truth to His creatures. Though his natural qualities be left intact, nothing in them that is vicious, sinful, testy, or capricious, nothing that can impair or disfigure the truth will be allowed to appear on the pages of God's revelation. Paul, right or wrong, may disagree with Barnabas on his journey, or may fall out with Cephas about disciplinary matters. But the Holy Ghost does not intend to consecrate by His inspiration these personal feelings, whether well or ill-founded. And, whoever insinuates the contrary, can only mean—we will not say to dishonor the Holy Spirit—but most assuredly to overthrow the whole Christian theory of inspiration. This is what Dr. Schaff does throughout his book. He represents the Apostles as narrow-minded partisans, divided into factions, standing on their dignity, if not huffishly inclined, differing from one another in their views of Christian doctrine. And all this he has discovered, not from independent historical sources, but from their *inspired* writings. What his notion of inspiration is may be easily guessed from this. It is one which any Rationalist or Infidel will readily allow. Lest we be suspected of exaggeration we quote a few passages to show the irreverent, contemptuous tone in which he speaks of Peter, Paul, James, John, and the rest, after praising them with words which are often in themselves offensive. It is the *Ave Rabbi* of the Passion offered once more to Christ our Lord in the person of His Apostles.

ST. JAMES.—"James appears as the most conservative of the Jewish converts, at the head of the extreme right wing, yet recognizing Paul as the Apostle of the Gentiles. . . . . He must, therefore, not be classed with the heretical Judaizers" (p. 267). "He was an honest (!), conscientious (!), eminently practical, conciliatory Jewish Christian saint,—the right man in the right place, and at the right time, although contracted in his mental vision" (ibid.). "He represented, as it were, the extreme right wing of the Jewish Church, bordering close on the Judaizing faction" (p. 344). "He had more the spirit of an ancient prophet, or of John the Baptist, than the spirit of Jesus (in whom he did not believe till after the resurrection); but for this very reason he had most authority over the Jewish Christians, and could reconcile the majority of them to the progressive (!) spirit of Paul" (p. 345). "He undoubtedly differs widely from Paul. . . . . There are multitudes of sincere, earnest, and faithful Christian workers, who never rise above the level of James, to the sublime height of Paul or John" (p. 271).

THE COUNCIL OF JERUSALEM.—Though the Apostles proclaim that the decrees of this Council were the work of the Holy Ghost (visum est SPIRITUI SANCTO et nobis), and the whole Christian world has ever so believed, yet Dr. Schaff has no more respect for it than he would have for an act of Congress, or of one of our legislatures. It was a "compromise" (p. 346) between conflicting parties, and, like all compromises, unsatisfactory. "It was liable to a double construction, and had in it the seed of future troubles. It was an armistice, rather than a final settlement" (p. 351). "The decree was deficient (!). It went far enough for the temporary emergency, and as far as the Jewish Church was willing to go, but not far enough for the cause of Christian union and Christian liberty in its legitimate development" (p. 349). He intimates that its illiberal character made it offensive to St. Paul, and that consequently he would not condescend to mention it in any of his Epistles. "Why does Paul never refer to this synodical decree? Because he could take a knowledge of it for granted; or more probably because he did not like altogether its restrictions, which were used by the illiberal constructionists against him and against Peter at Antioch" (p. 346). These illiberal constructionists, we are subsequently told (pp. 352 and 354), are the strict constructionists of the school of St. James.

ST. JOHN.—"In the first stadium of Apostolic Christianity, John figures as one of the three pillars of the Church of the circumcision, together with Peter and James, the brother of the Lord; while Paul and Barnabas represented the Gentile Church. This seems to imply that at that time he had not yet risen to the full apprehension of the universalism and freedom of the Gospel. But he was the most liberal (!) of the three, standing between James

and Peter on the one hand, and Paul on the other, and looking already towards a reconciliation of Jewish and Gentile Christianity. The Judaizers never appealed to him as they did to James or to Peter. There is no trace of a Johannean party, as there is of a Cephas party, and a party of James. He stood above strife and division" (p. 423). "The theology of the second and third centuries evidently presupposes the writings of John, and starts from his Christology, rather than from Paul's anthropology and soteriology, which were almost buried out of sight (!) until Augustin in Africa revived them" (p. 426).

St. Peter.—"Peter stands between James and Paul, and forms the transition from the extreme conservatism of the one to the progressive liberalism of the other" (p. 522). "His knowledge gradually widened and deepened with the expansion of Christianity and the conversion of Cornelius" (p. 523).

St. Mark.—"Mark has no distinct doctrinal type, but is catholic, irenic, unsectarian, and neutral, as regards the party questions within the Apostolic Church" (p. 635). On the very next page, in Rationalistic fashion, he contradicts all this, and quotes approvingly the remark of Dr. Morison: "There is not so much as a straw of evidence that the Gospel of Mark occupied a position of mediation or irenic neutrality in relation to the two other synoptic Gospels" (p. 636). Therefore Mark was and was not "irenic and neutral," and probably did not know his own mind. On the same page Dr. S. kindly concedes that Matthew and Luke "made their (historical) selections without altering or coloring the facts."

St. Luke.—"An irenic spirit, such as we may freely admit in the writings of Luke, does not imply an alteration or invention of facts. On the contrary, it is simply an unsectarian, catholic spirit, which aims at the truth, and nothing but the truth, and which is the first duty of the historian" (p. 669).

We could quote a great deal more, but what has been quoted shows the author's utter contempt for the Christian idea of inspiration. These "holy men of God," who "spoke inspired by the Holy Ghost," as St. Peter says, were narrow-minded partisans, who founded separate schools, and, when they did their best, only aimed at doctrinal compromises. We would rather see them openly denounced as demagogues and impostors by men of the stripe of Paulus and Renan, than hear them "damned with faint praise" by Dr. Schaff as catholic, irenic, unsectarian, honest, etc. These epithets to any Christian ear are more offensive than downright abuse. They only lead us to surmise that he would pour out the full measure of his rationalistic venom if he dared, if the ignorant Christian prejudices of the country, as he considers them, did not present too formidable a barrier to be attacked without extreme caution.

We have only a little space left to notice Dr. Schaff's virulent attacks on everything Catholic, or that Catholics regard with reverence. He begins with the Blessed Virgin, and denounces her whom all generations are bound to bless (either freely on earth or against their will in everlasting flames), as tainted with "actual and native sin" (p. 442). He thinks that she needs a Saviour, as if the Catholic Church (of whose doctrines he seems to know nothing) had not always taught and did not teach at this day the same thing. He shows his anti-Catholic hatred of her perpetual virginity by leaning to the hypothesis that the so-called "brothers of our Lord" (a Hebrew form of expression for cousins or relatives) were actually uterine brothers, children of the Blessed Virgin and St. Joseph. This brazen-faced hypothesis is caught up eagerly by all who wish to dishonor our Blessed Lady and the Church that alone fulfils her prophecy by doing her homage. An Episcopal clergyman of Ohio, some thirty years ago, wrote a book in favor of this unchristian opinion; and his bishop wrote a letter approving the book, on the score that it would do good service against the Roman Church, and its reverence for the Virgin Mother of God. It is impossible for a Catholic, however strong-minded and impartial, to listen to these things without fancying them mere echoes of the hissing of that infernal serpent who writhes, crushed and bruised, under her virgin heel.

St. Peter, like a true Protestant, he holds in horror and detestation, because he identifies him with the Church of Rome, and delights in pouring out his gall upon the latter by abusing her Apostle and founder. Peter, according to him, was guilty of sin, of public scandal, of downright hypocrisy (p. 355). He surrendered a vital principle, and was willing to allow Christianity "to shrink into a narrow corner as a Jewish sect" (ibid). "The whole scene (of Paul's quarrel with Peter) typically foreshadows the grand historical conflict between Petrine Catholicism and Pauline Protestantism (unmeaning, absurd words, which Dr. Schaff elsewhere makes a show of condemning as the invention of German Rationalism, but which he takes care to slyly insinuate as historically well-grounded throughout the whole of his book), which, we trust, will end at last in a grand Johannean reconciliation" (p. 358). He showed "cowardly fear of the narrow-minded Judaizers from Jerusalem." He was a "rock of offence and a stumbling-block" (ibid.). His modesty at the Last Supper was only "presumption." He showed his "consistent inconsistency" and cowardice by running away from martyrdom at the end of his life (ibid.). If Dr. Schaff hated St. Peter less, or loved truth more, he would have understood better the words of Origen and St. Ambrose, whom he has the face to quote in support of his wicked accusation. We may charitably suppose that he has quoted them second-hand, without read-

ing them, from his Rationalistic masters, Hilgenfeld, Tischendorf, and Lipsius. Peter, we have it repeated by Dr. Schaff, *usque ad nauseam*, was a married man, and carried his wife about with him on his missionary excursions; and this he makes an argument (p. 262) against "the claims of the Papacy!" One would suppose that Peter's marriage was a secret discovered for the first time by Dr. Schaff. Every Catholic has heard of it, and acknowledged it from the days of the Apostles to the present time. But following St. Jerome and the Fathers of the Church, we treat with deserved contempt Dr. Schaff's gratuitous romance about St. Peter's living with his wife after his call to the Apostleship. There are a few burning words in St. Jerome (*Commentary on Osee*, cap. ix.) touching heretical hatred of chastity, which we can scarcely forbear quoting in this connection, but we let them pass. Dr. S. thinks Peter's conduct at Antioch "irreconcilable with his infallibility as to discipline," and even with his "alleged supremacy" (p. 263). Now, why does Dr. S. deliberately falsify (we really can use no milder term) the doctrine of the Catholic Church? He knows, as well as any Catholic theologian, or the Vatican Council itself, that neither St. Peter nor his successors are infallible in disciplinary matters. And his saying so, against his better knowledge, is simply an effusion of blind hatred, which will not commend him to impartial readers. It is at utter variance with the canon he himself lays down: "The historian must first lay aside all prejudice and party zeal, and proceed in the pure love of truth" (p. 25). Let him abuse and decry St. Peter, if he will; but let him not belie or misrepresent him or the Church that was built on him. We are asking for very little. And if he could be shamed into the decency of common logic, where Catholic belief is concerned, we would ask him to think twice before asserting that the argument for Papal infallibility, drawn from Luke xxii. 31, 32 (*Rogavi pro te ut non deficiat fides tua. Et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos*), "would logically imply also that every Pope must deny Christ and be converted, in order to strengthen the brethren" (p. 256).

There is a great deal more of this anti-Catholic venom in Dr. Schaff's book, which is neither compatible with truth nor with the dignity of history. It is simply the pent-up indignation of an angry partisan, which he has neither the tact nor the good manners to restrain within proper bounds. And it shows that a man may write very becomingly of the way in which the historian should conduct his work (see pp. 22–27, § Duty of the Historian) without being willing or able to realize his ideal.

To sum up all that we have said in a few words, Dr. Schaff is nothing more than a bitter, unscrupulous, anti-Catholic partisan, who, to gratify his hatred of the Church and her Founder, has no

difficulty in sacrificing historical truth in a book which he and his admirers call a *History of the Christian Church.* As an expounder of Protestant Christianity honesty does not shine amongst his qualifications. He is simply a cunning, Rationalistic wolf, dressed up in Evangelical sheep's clothing.

THE AMERICAN HIERARCHY IN ITS THREEFOLD SOURCE.

THREE REPRESENTATIVE BISHOPS.

Don Fray Juan de Zumárraga, primér Obispo y Arzobispo de Mexico. Estudio Biografico y Bibliografico por Joaquin Garcia Icazbalceta. Mexico, 1881. 8vo, 371, 278 pp.

Monseigneur de Saint-Vallier et l'Hôpital Général de Québec. Quebec, 1882. 8vo, 743 pp.

Leben und Wirken des hochseligen Johannes Nep. Neumann, aus der Congregation des allerh. Erlösers, Bischofs von Philadelphia, von P. John Nep. Berger, aus der Congregation des allerh. Erlösers. New York. Benziger Bros., 1883. 12mo, 405 pp.

THERE is something grand in the sources of our hierarchy, recent though it be, and apparently unable to boast of ancient glory; of heroic prelaty confronting with dignity the assaults of error wielded by the power of Rome, the sophistry of Greece, the brutal tyranny of feudalism, or greed and passion cloaked in the rags of would-be learning. Our hierarchy seems to date back only a century; yet this is but a dim and poor idea. The eye of faith reaches farther back, back into the annals of the Church.

Three ancient European sees, betokening and representing as many time-honored hierarchies of the Old World, full of the apostolic injunction, extended their ministry to the ends of the earth, beyond the vast ocean which sobbed and seethed unceasingly before them. And from this threefold source come lines of bishops blending into the present hierarchy of the United States.

By a singular Providence, a petty strip on our Atlantic coast

shows the three European sees exercising jurisdiction on our continent, not by a mere fiction, but really and with the full apostolic spirit.

Just at the close of the first quarter of the sixteenth century, the Dominican Father c Montésinos reared a chapel in honor of St. Michael on the banks of the James as the stream rolled on in its course to meet the bay, which Catholicity had consecrated as St. Mary's. The Dominicans stood there in the Western World, with no other angel of the Mass looking on them for thousands of miles in any direction. Each of them stood there as a priest of the diocese of Seville, with faculties from the Archbishop of that venerable Iberian see, acknowledging his jurisdiction.

A century later Father Isaac Jogues, of the Society of Jesus, preached to the Indians of the Mohawk, and exercised the ministry in the Dutch hamlet of New Amsterdam, where the majestic Hudson sweeps through its mountain course to kiss the sea. Whence came his faculties? His superior, he would tell you, was Vicar-General of the Archbishop of Rouen.

Already between these points the associates of the Jesuit Father Andrew White were offering the holy sacrifice, were administering the sacraments, were winning to the fold the dusky son of the forest, and emigrants whose ancestors had yielded to the violence or cajoling of heresy in Europe. These Fathers, and the sons of St. Francis who labored with them, acknowledged the jurisdiction of the Vicar Apostolic of England, then the sole representative of the ancient hierarchy of the Island of Great Britain.

Here, on a little strip of our coast, we behold the cross planted under the authority of the ancient hierarchies of England, France, and Spain, all bowing reverently to the overruling authority of Rome. This event was not a mere strange, evanescent accident. As Spain's colonization extended, Seville gladly yielded her authority to local bishops appointed by the Holy See. Saint Domingo and Mexico became bishoprics, each in time the head of a hierarchy which sent its apostolic men over the southern part of the lands our republic now includes, and exercising at first directly, and later through suffragans complete episcopal jurisdiction. The first Bishop of Louisiana was a suffragan of Saint Domingo, as the first Bishop of Mobile was of the new metropolitan the Archbishop of Santiago de Cuba. The first bishops of Sonora and the Californias were suffragans of the see of Mexico. Their successors in those dioceses, and those formed out of them in later days, can claim apostolic succession from the glorious Church of Spain, the Church of St. Isidore and St. Leander, of St. Ildephonsus, of Hosius of Cordoba, of St. Thomas of Villanova, of St. Fructuosus, St. Turibins, St. Julian, and St. Eulogius.

So in time the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Rouen, exercised from Labrador to Texas, devolved on Francis de Laval de Montmorency, first Bishop of Petra, and then first Bishop of Quebec. Under his sucessors priests spread through the West and Southwest, planting the faith, and suffragans arose in time from ocean to ocean, till a bishop was consecrated for Oregon; the Archbishop of that see and his suffragans claim their descent from a Church that can point in history to St. Trophemus of Arles, and St. Pothenus of Lyons, St. Maximin of Aix, St. Irenæus of Lyons, St. Martin and St. Gregory of Tours, St. Hilary of Arles, St. Germanius of Auxerre, St. Mello of Rouen, St. Louis of Toulouse.

The see of Baltimore and all that have sprung from it, the dioceses east of the Mississippi, trace their origin to the Church illustrated by the virtues and sufferings of St. Dunstan, St. Elphege, St. Chad, St. Augustine, St. Cuthbert, St. Asaph, St. Hugh, St. John of Beverly, St. Edmund, and the great St. Anselm of Canterbury.

While the hierarchy thus is linked to England, France, and Spain, Providence has sent to our land many thousands from Ireland, whose apostle St. Patrick received episcopal consecration at the hands of a bishop in Gaul, and from Germany, whose early apostles, Boniface and Virgil, received their orders in the churches to which St. Patrick and St. Dunstan belonged.

Far back as the history of the Church in this country dates, she came not as a novel institution, a mere religious experiment, she came in her episcopal jurisdiction, her priesthood, and her faithful, full of the memories, the tradition, the faith and the liturgy of more than fifteen centuries, to transmit them faithfully three centuries and more to our day. In this view the Church stands the grandest factor in American history, the most vital, the most expansive, yet the most conservative principle in American life.

Three works have recently appeared that typify, in a manner, the three sources of our hierarchy, three centuries of the Church's life in America. These are the life of Father John de Zumárraga, first Bishop and first Archbishop of Mexico (1527–48), by the eminent Mexican scholar Joaquin Garcia Icazbalceta; the life of John Baptist de la Croix de Chevrières de St. Vallier, second Bishop of Quebec (1688–1727), and the life of the Right Rev. John Nepomucene Neumann, C.SS.R., fourth Bishop of Philadelphia (1852–60), by one who, like the saintly bishop himself, is one of the sons of St. Alphonsus Liguori.

The life of Bishop Zumárraga, which is one of the most important studies on early Mexican history that has appeared in our time, sprang from the bibliographical studies of the author. With-

out any idea of contributing to ecclesiastical history, he began to collect notes on Bishop Zumárraga for a *Bibliografia Mexicana del Siglo* XVI. The first printing press in the New World was set up in Mexico, and the clergy were its directors. Many of the *Incunabula Americana* are connected with Bishop Zumárraga; the author's notes grew rapidly, discussions arose, and the result is in the careful and judicious volume under consideration. It is not the work of priest or bishop, who can be supposed to be biased by his sacred calling to exalt the subject of his biographical labors into a spiritual hero, but the calm judicious work of a layman, an historical scholar, known for patient and accurate investigation, for an acquaintance with printed and documentary material possessed by few, and for a sound, impartial judgment, that have won respect for his writings in all countries.

"Among the victims of ignorance and party spirit," says our author, "stands pre-eminent Don Fray Juan de Zumárraga, first Bishop and Archbishop of Mexico. Thanks in a great measure to the declamations of vulgar writers—men who wrote without reading, or read only to lie more effectively—this worthy and beneficent prelate has come at last to be, in the conception of many, the type of an ignorant and fanatical friar. But they do not depreciate and belittle him from any zeal for justice or love of truth, but at times from pure ignorance, and in many cases because they think, with sorry logic, that in his person they assail the religion which he professed and which was the mainspring of all his actions. Religion, the Church, the priesthood, these are the real target of their shafts." . . . . "I regret to add that not only among the vulgar herd of writers are found impassioned detractors of the illustrious bishop; historians of note, who at one time attained great popularity, have accepted without examination and supported by their authority the falsehoods of which the bishop has been the victim." It will at once occur to the minds of our readers how Prescott prostituted great natural talent to a bitter and unreasoning hatred of Catholicity, under the influence of which he seizes every opportunity to paint in revolting colors every type of Catholicity. In his hands Zumárraga becomes a monster.

Freethinkers in Mexico caught readily at these slanders and they were constantly repeated, but of late a more favorable judgment of the bishop began to gain ground. Yet it was necessary to show, as Señor Icazbalceta well says, "that far from having been an ignorant friar, a blind, incarnate destroyer of the monuments of Mexican civilization, Bishop Zumárraga was an apostolic man, poor, humble, learned, zealous, prudent, enlightened, and charitable; a mortal enemy of all superstition and tyranny, an in-

defatigable propagator of the true doctrine of Jesus Christ, a protector of the weak ones of his flock, a benefactor of the people in the material as well as in the moral order, and eminently practical in all his regulations and counsels. If at times he erred, let us use some indulgence towards a man who did so much good, remembering that he was a man, and a man of his time."

The life of the first Bishop of Mexico, amid a horde of adventurers, eager for fame and wealth and power, who chafed under any restraint, was not one of inglorious ease. He strove manfully to do his duty, and roused deep and lasting enmity. His life of struggle has been followed by years of misrepresentation. Now at last the time has come for an impartial judgment.

Juan de Zumárraga, as he is known in the annals of St. Francis and in the Church, was born in Durango, a town in Biscay not far from Bilboa, in that sturdy north of Spain which has given so many men of power. He was born apparently about 1468, and took the habit of St. Francis in the austere convent of Abrojo. He was guardian of that convent, when in 1527 the Emperor Charles V. chose it for his retreat in Holy Week. On leaving he offered the guardian a royal alms; but Father Zumárraga declined it persistently till he feared he would exasperate the great ruler, and when he at last accepted the donation, it was only to distribute it at once among the poor, without reserving anything for his community. Father Zumárraga had already been guardian of several convents, and provincial; Charles saw in him learning, piety, disinterestedness, and love for the poor; and he had the truly royal gift of selecting able men. When soon after a witchcraft excitement broke out, the Emperor selected this religious to investigate the whole matter; it is known "that he discharged his duty with rectitude and maturity." His worst enemies fail to show that he acted with rashness, credulity, or cruelty. From all that we know, we can place him in a higher rank than the clergy of Prescott's Province of Massachusetts a century later.

At this time there was but one bishop on the American continent, the Dominican Julian Garces, appointed in 1519 Caroline bishop, or Bishop of Santa Maria de los Remedios de Yucatan, who in 1526 fixed his see at Tlascala, though now at Puebla. The city of Mexico, however, the capital, needed a bishop. It did not require much reflection on the part of the Emperor to fix on the choice of the new prelate, for he had not forgotten the devout guardian of Abrojo, on whom he had already fixed his attention. He presented him for the new see, December 12th, 1527.

Mexico was then in a most discordant state. Cortez had arrayed against him a host of military and civil officials, and the

court was overrun with complaints and accusations on both sides. The very judges sent to investigate and establish order only increased the disorders.

The bishop elect before receiving his bulls or episcopal consecration resolved to proceed to the spot, to be able to see exactly the position in which the Church and matters ecclesiastical were in the realm of Mexico. He sailed from Seville in August, 1528, and reached the city of Mexico on the last month of that year. There he found that Cortez had gone to Spain to seek justice; his enemies were in full power, and all combined to oppress the Indians, extorting money from the petty monarchs and chiefs, and resorting to every violence. The stern justice of the bishop elect was at once aroused, but it only drew on him personal abuse. The Emperor, however, had made him protector of the Indians; and though *conquistadores* and the magistrates were against him, the religious were the faithful champions of the rights of the natives. Being only bishop elect, his power was limited, but he presented to the Audience his appointment as Protector of the Indians, and requested their aid to enforce his authority. This was evaded, but the Indian rulers hearing of the arrival of a Protector flocked to him with presents. These he declined, but when he heard the story of their wrongs, he felt compelled to investigate many cases. The Audience took alarm and forbade him to interfere in Indian matters. The bishop replied that he would meet them to examine his authority, but he would not shrink from fulfilling his duty, though it should cost him his life. The Audience repeated their order, threatening to banish him and seize his revenues; and any Spaniard who appealed to the bishop was made liable to forfeit his Indians, and any Indian having recourse to him was menaced with death. When the bishop, after private conference with Guzman and other members of the Audience, threatened from the pulpit that he would lay the whole matter before the King, Guzman declared that he would hurl the preacher from his pulpit.

This was no idle threat, for when the Audience published a manifesto against the Franciscans, accusing them of the grossest crimes, Father Antonio Ortiz, ascending the pulpit in presence of the bishop to protest their innocence, was dragged from it by order of the Audience and sentenced to banishment.

As the Audience intercepted all letters, the bishop was unable to address the Emperor till August, 1529, when he took letters himself to Vera Cruz and placed them in safe hands.

On the report that Cortez was returning fully justified, Guzman gathered a force and went to conquer new territories. The other Auditors ruled as violently as ever, and, seizing two ecclesiastics

who were in custody of the Church authorities, imprisoned them and put them to torture. The bishop proceeded with his clergy to demand their release, but was attacked and nearly killed with a lance. The Auditors, though threatened with excommunication and interdict, hung and quartered the prisoners.

At last Cortez arrived, and a new Audience restored order. Yet the accusations of the late Auditors had borne fruit; the royal letters commanded the bishop to obey the Audience, and summoned him to Spain. His bulls had been issued September 2, 1530.

Accompanied by a son of Montezuma, and other Mexican princes, the bishop reached Spain in 1532, to confront at the splendid court of Charles V. the Auditor Delgadillo, who presented thirty-four charges against the bishop. His replies were complete and overwhelming. New bulls were obtained to correct errors in those of 1530, and on the 27th of April, 1533, he was solemnly consecrated at Valladolid by Diego de Ribera, Bishop of Segovia. His first act was a fervent appeal to the mendicant orders to aid him in converting the Indians of his vast diocese. He followed it up by visits to many parts of Spain to secure missionaries, and, doubtless, whatever was required in a country where all was to be begun.

Meanwhile he obtained new and positive laws to secure the freedom of the Indians and save them from cruelty and oppression.

His efforts to secure clergy failed, and he returned to Mexico alone in October, 1534. His diocese was now defined, his cathedral canonically erected, but he found secular clergy few, and not all possessed of proper faculties, some who had drifted along with the emigration, some adventurers—not many who came duly qualified or fitted by learning, experience and high character to aid him in giving the new diocese a proper organization. The regular clergy, especially the Franciscans, were devoted almost exclusively to the conversion of the Indians. These religious had been almost all selected for their work, and were eminently fitted for it by learning, piety, and devotedness. The prompt and complete overthrow of the Aztec monarchy, and the suppression of idolatry with its sanguinary rites, had left the common people free. An ancient tradition led them to expect men in white who were to stop the human sacrifices and revive a pure and ancient faith. While the nobles clung to idolatry and the polygamy it permitted to the great, and the heathen priesthood struggled to uphold the system by which they obtained power and wealth, the humble classes flocked to the missionaries for instruction and bap-

tism. The religious were comparatively few, the applicants many; to meet the emergency they baptized as soon as the catechumens were sufficiently instructed, and without adhering to the prescribed seasons of Easter and Pentecost, and without employing all the ceremonies in the ritual for the administration of the sacrament of baptism. The marriage of the new converts, where the man had been a polygamist, involved difficulties, and, when Bishop Zumárraga came as consecrated ruler of the diocese, grave questions demanded solution.

In concert with some neighboring bishops, he adopted regulations in 1539 to carry out the bull *altitudo divini consilii* of Pope Paul III., but the religious, relying on the extraordinary privileges conferred by the *Omnimoda*, the famous bulls of Adrian VI., were far from adhering strictly to the episcopal regulations, which they regarded as the well-meant but impracticable rules of prelates utterly ignorant of the language, necessities and condition of the tribes among whom the missionaries labored.

In 1537 Bishop Zumárraga performed the first act of episcopal consecration on our continent, conferring by the imposition of hands the dignity of bishop on Francis Marroquin, elected to the see of Guatemala; and in the following year he consecrated the bishops of Michoacan and Oajaca. One of the first acts of this little band of bishops was to consider the convocation of the General Council of Trent, and to decide whether they were required to leave the dioceses which they had just entered in order to proceed to Trent. They addressed the King of Spain to solicit from the Pope liberty for them to remain in America. At the same time they begged his Majesty to send good and learned secular and regular priests. A school for the instruction of young Indian boys was established at Tlatelolco, and one for girls was projected.

Pope Alexander VI. gave the tithes in America to the King of Spain; Julius II. bestowed on him the patronage of all benefices, so that, "except in matters purely spiritual, the Spanish monarchs exercised an authority that seems pontifical. Without their permission no church, monastery or hospital could be erected; still less could diocese or parish be created."

The position of the first Bishop of Mexico can be conceived. The tithes were in the hands of the civil power; the Church had no property giving an income for the maintenance of religion; his own support and that of his cathedral clergy depended on allowances from the crown, mainly out of the tithes. Out of his scanty income Bishop Zumárraga expended much in charity, and in giving dignity to the divine worship, which, even with this aid,

was offered in great poverty. So far was the Church in Mexico from abounding in wealth in its early days, that as late as 1582 we find a stipulation made with the choir that they were to wait for their salaries till the cathedral was able to pay, and not bring suits as had been done. Canons, on their appointment, too, agreed to forego their allowance till there was a revenue to meet it.

In Bishop Zumárraga's time no steps were taken to erect a cathedral or bishop's house.

Bishop Zumárraga made frequent visitations of his diocese, and labored to reform his clergy and flock. Unworthy clergymen he subjected to severe discipline. He enforced the sanctification of Sundays and holidays, and induced the passage of civil laws for the same object. The number of Spaniards in Mexico who had left a wife and family in Europe was productive of much vice; and regulations were made requiring them to return to Spain or to send for the wife within a certain time. His zeal for the instruction of his flock led him to prepare suitable books, and have others in Spanish and Mexican, which were printed and distributed. He is thus the founder of the printing press in America, and the first known author whose works were published here, the Church fostering the art in Mexico as in Germany and England. A catechism issued by the good bishop in 1539 is the first issue of the American press, preceding by a full century anything printed in English colonies. A Manual in 1540; a Doctrina Cristiana in 1544, written by Bishop Zumárraga, and characterized by Señor Icazbalceta as learned and eloquent; the Tripartite of Gerson, as well as the Doctrina Cristiana of Pedro de Cordova, and Richel on Processions, were issued the same year, the last published by the bishop to prevent dances and other unseemly conduct in the religious processions, especially on Corpus Christi. Other catechetical works, Spanish and Mexican, followed in 1545, 6, 7, 8, 50. Of these copies are actually known, but, as Señor Icazbalceta believes, there were others to show how anxious he was to see that his flock were properly instructed in the faith, and it will surprise some to learn that the first and a most eloquent exhortation to read the Holy Scriptures printed in America was written by the first Bishop of Mexico and issued in that city in the first half of the sixteenth century.

Bishop Zumárraga was appointed Apostolic Inquisitor, but he never organized the tribunal or used the title; one case alone is cited in which a lord of Tezcoco was convicted of murder, in offering a human sacrifice, and was handed over to the secular arm.

The cares of his diocese and advancing age did not quench the zeal of the Bishop of Mexico. His great desire was to end his

days as a missionary in China, and he actually petitioned the King of Spain and the Pope for permission to resign his mitre and proceed as a simple missionary to that great empire in Asia. He made preparations for this undertaking, but when he was commanded to remain in Mexico he submitted.

In 1546 the bishops of Mexico, Guatemala, Oajaca, Chiapas and Michoacan assembled with the heads of the religious and learned ecclesiastics. They adopted several resolutions, maintaining, 1st, the right of Indians to their property; 2d, the illegality of war made on them under the pretence of effecting their conversion; 3d, that the powers granted to the King of Spain by the Holy See were based solely on the extension of religion and not intended for their aggrandizement; and 4th, that they did not impair the rights of the Indians; 5th, that the powers involved the duty of the monarchs to maintain missionaries.

This episcopal assembly was the last public act in which Bishop Zumárraga took part. His duties occupied his whole time, for his church was new, his zeal great, and his flock numerous. The natives required protection and instruction, the Spaniards reformation, the clergy vigilance. His advanced age and increasing infirmities told that the close of his career was at hand; and anxious to employ the short term allowed him, he redoubled his exertions instead of seeking the repose he had earned so justly. Confirmation had as yet been sparingly bestowed on the Indians, but in April, 1548, he began to confer that sacrament, and in forty days four hundred thousand were presented. In discharging this duty he would not stop to eat or rest, so that his attendants were forced to keep back the throngs and remove the mitre from his head. Many believed that his death was hastened by this excessive labor in one broken by age and sickness.

An unexpected event suddenly disturbed the venerable and humble prelate. As several dioceses had now been established and organized in New Spain they needed a metropolitan less remote than Seville. In the secret consistory of February 11, 1546, Pope Paul III. raised the See of Mexico to an archbishopric, giving it as suffragans Oajaca, Michoacan, Tlascala, Guatemala, and Chiapas. Bishop Zumárraga was made the first archbishop and the pallium was forthwith dispatched to him.

Thus Seville, the foster mother of the Church in America, resigned her care over the flock that had gathered and been gathered in the New World.

Archbishop Zumárraga was confirming his Indian neophytes at Ocuituco when the tidings of his unexpected promotion arrived. It filled his soul with trouble. How could he who deemed himself unworthy of the episcopal office, preside over his brother bishops?

His humility prompted him to decline the honor, but he feared to disobey the Vicar of Christ. He hastened back to Mexico to take advice. The religious urged him to accept; his confessor, Father Dominic de Betanzos, was absent, and he hastened to the village where he was. He spent four days with that great missionary, confirming every day. When he was urged to rest, he told them that they would soon be without a bishop, and that he must do all he could. On the 24th of May it was necessary to carry him back to Mexico.

After his arrival there he thought only of preparing for his end. Two letters written in those days reveal the simplicity of his truly just soul. "I die very poor but very happy," he wrote to Charles V., imploring him to see that his see was promptly and worthily filled. A generous man had acted as his steward, and managed his affairs; the good bishop wished to provide for what might be due him. After thus adjusting his affairs, he received the last sacraments with great devotion. An hour before his death he exclaimed to those around him: "Oh! Father, it is one thing to talk of being at the article of death, but how different it is to be really there." In the full possession of his faculties he expired at nine in the morning on the 3d of June, 1548, Sunday within the octave of Corpus Christi, his last words being: "Into thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit."

The grief of his flock was universal. The mass was inaudible from the sobs and wailings of the Spaniards and Mexicans who filled the Cathedral, for though he had begged to be buried in the church of his order, the clergy and people insisted on interring the first bishop where he had presided so worthily.

His remains are there still; in the chapel of Saint Peter, the place marked by a stone. A gremial used by the great bishop is still possessed by the Cathedral, having escaped the profaning hands of revolutionists.

Bishop Zumárraga labored efficiently to convert the Indians, and to instruct them in piety and secular knowledge established schools and houses attached to the monasteries where the young were received. He encouraged and aided the erection of hospitals and infirmaries for the sick; he introduced European fruit trees and encouraged the Indians to cultivate silk, and brought over mechanics to instruct the Indians. "Thus," says Señor Icazbalceta, "did the first pastor of our Church extend his benefits to all this land. Missionaries, schools, college, the press, books for the ignorant; asylums and hospitals; dowries and alms for orphans and the poor; employment and new industrial pursuits for the people; increased revenue for the state; lustre to religion and divine worship; light to the heathen, peace, concord, justice, charity to

all; naught was neglected, everything attended to by this friar, who had spent most of his life in cloistered seclusion."[1]

We have given but an outline of the grand and noble volume which the Mexican scholar consecrates to the life of Archbishop Zumárraga. Impartial, accurate, suppressing nothing, extenuating nothing, he presents us with a full and lifelike picture of the prelate and his times. Here we behold the Church in Spanish America as it was in its origin under the powers granted to the Catholic sovereigns by the Pope, and used at first as they were intended to be, but which, abused in our day by petty states, have become one of the greatest obstacles to the well-being of the Church.

Let us turn now to the Church in New France. The early missionaries in Canada under the fostering care of the see of Rouen carried the cross from the mouth of the Kennebec and St. Lawrence to the valley of the Hudson and the shores of Lake Superior. In 1658 the Holy See made this vast portion of the continent a Vicariate Apostolic, and relieving the Archbishop of Rouen, confided it to Francis de Laval de Montmorency, created Bishop of Petra. Sixteen years later it became the diocese of Quebec, after Father Marquette had extended its limits through the valley of the Mississippi. The see of Quebec was saved from Gallicanism by being made directly dependent on Rome. The noble figure of Bishop Laval commences well the line of Canadian prelates. For thirty years he labored to introduce priests, to establish a seminary, to regulate parishes, create schools, and develop and increase the communities devoted to education and the service of the sick and afflicted. The French government did not attempt everything as that of Spain did, and never obtained such ample powers from the Holy See; but it at times hampered sadly the action of the Church, and at one period, when the bishop and his clergy sought to check, by ecclesiastical censures, the unbridled sale of liquor to the Indians, which was sweeping the native tribes from the earth, the governor generals and their partisans, looking only to the gain of the fur trade, declared open war on the protectors of the Indians.

When Bishop Laval prepared to resign his see, which he finally did in 1688, the King of France proposed as his successor, John Baptist de la Croix de Chevrières, of an old and distinguished family, in which the mitre seemed almost hereditary, his grandfather and uncle having successively filled the see of Grenoble. Trained to piety by his mother, young St. Vallier while at college resolved to devote himself to the service of the Church. His vocation was tested by Stephen le Camus, an able director, who encouraged

1 We have already in these pages shown how ably Sr. Icazbalceta defends the bishop from the charge of destroying Mexican manuscripts.

him to persevere. During his years of study his fervor did not relax, and he was proclaimed doctor at the Sorbonne in 1672. After his ordination he became one of the canons of the cathedral of Grenoble, and by his studious life, his alms and exemplary discharge of his duties, won general esteem. The post of chaplain in ordinary to the king gave him a position at court as dangerous for a young priest as it was flattering, but he discharged his duties with a zeal that sought the improvement of all under his care, and none were too humble or distressed to be visited by the chaplain, whose rebukes were as kind as they were just, and whose exhortations won many to a better life. He attended Louis XIV. in one of his campaigns in Flanders, and was so highly esteemed by the monarch that he wished to nominate him for the archbishopric of Tours, but the young priest refused it, as he did other important sees. When it was, however, proposed that he should become the coadjutor of the Bishop of Quebec, he showed more inclination to accept a position in which there would be more labor and less honor.

Before deciding absolutely he accepted from Bishop Laval the position of Vicar General, and resolved to visit Canada, in that capacity, and thus become personally acquainted with the country, which many portrayed to him in most unattractive colors. The high-born French abbé, chaplain at the Court of Louis XIV., contrasts strongly with the austere and humble friar who first filled the see of Mexico, and the visit to America before ordination is one point of resemblance. Reaching Quebec in 1685 he was received with honor and respect. The churches and institutions, for Quebec boasted then her Cathedral and Seminary, the College of the Jesuits, the Convent of the Recollects, the Ursulines with their Academy, the Augustinian Nuns with their Hospital, gave the proposed bishop an encouraging idea of the diocese. He then visited the settlements up to Montreal, with the Indian convert villages. At a later date he descended the river, and by way of Riviere du Loup and the St. John's he reached Nova Scotia, and passing from settlement to settlement reached Tadoussac, and ascending to Quebec found the Ursulines homeless, amid the ruins of their convent, which the flames had devoured.

When the Abbé de Saint Vallier made a report to Louis XIV. on the condition of religion in his American colony, the king again pressed him to accept a bishopric in France, but as he found the young priest immovable, he nominated him. Bulls were expedited at Rome, July 27th, 1687, the last issued at the request of Louis XIV. To prepare for his episcopal life, he made a pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Francis de Sales, and then was consecrated in the Church of St. Sulpice, Paris, January 25th, 1688, by the coadjutor

of the Archbishop of Rouen. He set sail immediately for his diocese, and reached Quebec on the 3d of June. The knowledge he had acquired of the wants had enabled him to obtain much-needed relief, and the parishes and institutions all benefited by his judicious aid. A hospital for the aged and incurable was soon projected, and he appealed to the venerable Margaret Bourgeoys to undertake. The war then raging between France and England, however, menaced Canada with ruin, and in 1690 an English fleet was hurling shot and shell at the city of Quebec. God protected Canada; the baffled fleet retired, to lose by wreck and disaster, and Quebec erected the Church of Our Lady of Victory, in devout thanksgiving for the wonderful deliverance. Bishop de Saint Vallier instituted a feast of Our Lady of Victory, to be celebrated every year on the Sunday nearest the 21st of October.

He then proceeded to France, and laid before the king some questions that had arisen between him and the Seminary, which were adjusted by royal authority. The king also authorized him to establish Recollect Fathers at several points in Canada and Acadia, and also issued letters patent which enabled him to carry out his great project, the erection of a general hospital at Quebec. Having arranged all this, the Bishop returned to Canada, accompanied by a number of Recollect Fathers and secular priests.

He purchased of the Recollects, their Convent of Notre Dame des Anges, on St. Charles River, and enlarged it for sisters whom he transferred from the Hotel Dieu. But his residence in his diocese was not prolonged. In the autumn of 1694 he was again traversing the ocean; his administration had excited difficulties; the system which had grown up in Canada, and which his predecessor had adopted so far as circumstances permitted, seemed to Bishop Saint Vallier too much at variance with that of the diocese of France to be continued. His attempt to reorganize met strong opposition, and so many complaints were made that many persons of influence in France urged him to resign the see of Quebec. Louis XIV., to prevent further difficulty, intimated to the Bishop his wish that he should not return to Canada. He laid the case before Bossuet, Fénélon, and the Archbishop of Paris, and they agreed that if Bishop de Saint Vallier did not resign his see, he ought not to be detained in France. Louis XIV., after vainly endeavoring to induce him to resign, permitted him in 1697 to return to Quebec.

There one of his first acts was to erect the sisters at the Hospital General into a separate community. This excited a new storm, and when some novices had been allowed to take their vows in the new establishment, orders came from France that all the sisters were to be sent back to the Hotel Dieu. The new hospital would

have succumbed at once, had not the Hotel Dieu refused to receive or recognize the sisters who had just taken their vows. They remained, therefore, and the great establishment due to Bishop Saint Vallier was saved.

To place it on a firm basis, he once more visited France in 1700, and obtained of the king authority to carry out his original plans. He then visited Rome, to lay before Pope Clement XI. the affairs of his diocese, and to obtain the canonical annexation to his see of certain abbeys in France, which, according to the custom of that time, had been assigned to him. On his return he bore to the King from the Pope, a piece of the true cross. After presenting this to Louis XIV., he embarked for Canada, but the vessel was captured by an English fleet, and the Bishop, who was sick and helpless, was brutally treated by the English sailors, who robbed him of his cross and ring, and burned in the galley the relics which he was carrying to his diocese. On reaching England, he was sent to Rochester; he was detained in England for many years as a prisoner, in retaliation for the confinement by Louis XIV. of the Baron de Mean, dean of the Cathedral of Liège. During his forced stay in England, he received, it is stated, from the Pope, an appointment as Vicar Apostolic for that country. It was not till 1713 that he was set at liberty, and reached France. There he found that the Court was opposed to his return to Canada. The prime minister urged him to resign his see, defer visiting his diocese, or at least to accept a coadjutor. But Bishop Saint Vallier was unyielding except in regard to a coadjutor, and, after much delay, once more reached his Cathedral in August, 1713. A coadjutor had been appointed and consecrated, but he remained in France, and to him Bishop de Saint Vallier confided the care of religion in Louisiana. The coadjutor, Francis Duplessis de Mornay, a member of the Capuchin Order, confided to the friars of his branch of the Order of St. Francis the care of the French settlers in Louisiana, which they retained till the beginning of this century.

Bishop de Saint Vallier, thus restored to his diocese, labored there in peace, till his death, December 26th, 1727, at the age of 74. He was interred in the Chapel of the Sacred Heart of Mary, attached to the hospital which had been the constant object of his care.

We cannot regard Monseigneur de Saint Vallier as one of the great bishops of Quebec. His name is associated with one great work of local charity, rather than with any important results in the administration of his diocese. He is remarkable, rather for his misfortunes, for his complications with the meddlesome spirit of the ministry in France, for his long imprisonment. A man of real and solid piety, irreproachable as priest and bishop, he had

lived at court without acquiring the tact and suppleness of a courtier, and drew much on himself by his inflexibility in pursuing his projects, and resisting all modification. His mind, however, tended to bring his diocese into the circle of Gallican thought and practice, and there is ground to believe that, had he remained in full power and active administration during his term, he would have undone much of the work of Bishop Laval, and imbued his clergy and diocese with the very ideas from which its origin and position enabled it to escape.

His visitations of his vast diocese are not recorded. He prepared a ritual and a catechism, and in pastoral letters endeavored to reach his flock in all parts.

On the 1st of May, 1698, he formally established a mission of the Seminary of Quebec in the valley of the Mississippi, and zealous priests, led by M. de Montigny, labored there for years, two, Messrs. de Saint Cosme and Foucault, dying by the hands of Indians. The mission founded by Bishop de Saint Vallier included the parish of Tamaroa or Cahokia, directed by the priests of the Seminary of Quebec till Canada passed into English hands.

Bishop de Saint Vallier, as we have seen, subsequently through his coadjutor confided the parochial care of the Louisiana settlement to the Capuchins; he also committed the Indian mission in that province to the Jesuit Fathers, some of whom, like Poisson, Souel, Senat, met death with a heroism which the maligners of the Order would do well to imitate.

The life of this Bishop, blended as it is with that of the General Hospital and the community which has so nobly directed it for nearly two centuries, is of course less satisfactory than a separate sketch, and is not marked by the calm dignity and accurate research of the Spanish work already considered.

The third book before us belongs to the Church, sprang from that which grew like an undying plant beneath the tread of persecution, exclusion, disfranchisement, and penal law,—the Church during our Colonial days. The power of Charles V., of Philip II., protected the Church in New Spain; that of a Henry IV., a Louis XIV., that in New France. The hatred of Catholicity engendered in a corrupt court had at last leavened the whole English nation, and, with the exception of Maryland, every colony planted by Great Britain on our shores shows in its fundamental charter, or in its laws, that Catholicity was regarded as an enemy, and its adherents were marked out for vengeance. If Maryland for a season gave the Catholic freedom to worship God, a Protestant ascendency soon replaced the principle of toleration by that of persecution, till the power fell from its hands, and then, with an effrontery equal to

its former cruelty and ingratitude, it claimed toleration as its own especial glory. No Catholic could enter Georgia; none could be introduced into Maryland except under heavy penalty; no priest dare enter New England or New York; no church could be opened publicly except in Pennsylvania. The Maryland Catholic, in the colony which his ancestors founded, was ground down with double taxes, deprived of arms for self-defence, excluded from every office, and, beyond the Potomac, he was degraded to the level of the negro slave; his evidence was rejected in the courts, so that if a murder was committed in the presence of Catholics only, the red-handed murderer walked away, unscathed, from the bar of justice.

Yet a noble band of American Catholics clung to the faith, and with devoted priests awaited the Lord. He came at last and turned a storm engendered in hatred of Catholicity into the instrument of its deliverance and redemption. Diplomatists of Catholic Europe, accredited to the Continental Congress, fostered the young republic; the fleets and armies of Catholic France and Spain struck at the common foe, from New England to Pensacola; Catholic colonist and Catholic Indian bore their part in the struggle, and a Catholic chaplain received the earliest commission from Congress, and discharged his duties till peace disbanded the army.

The Church in the Colonies, proscribed and persecuted, stood forth the free Church of the Republic. The hierarchy that could not be restored in England could, however, be created in what was destined to be a greater Britain. Pope Pius VI. established the see of Baltimore, with a diocese including the whole United States. The first bishop, the venerable John Carroll, lived to see religion spread and prosper so that his vast diocese was divided, new sees created, and bishops as suffragans gathered around his archiepiscopal throne.

The see of Baltimore was founded in 17—; in a score of years Philadelphia was established as a bishopric. The line of bishops begins with the pious Franciscan, Michael Egan, consecrated on the 28th of October, 1810. The see was filled in succession by the Right Rev. Conwell, whose coadjutor, Dr. Francis Patrick Kenrick, governed the diocese till his promotion to the metropolitan see of Baltimore, illustrating both dioceses with his great theological and biblical learning, his strict discharge of his episcopal duties, his zeal in providing for the wants of the flock committed to his care.

His successor in Philadelphia was the Right Rev. John Nepomucene Neumann, whose life is before us. He was the first bishop of German origin appointed on the Atlantic coast, and the old associations of Pennsylvania, where German Catholics had set-

tled in numbers in colonial days, and German priests labored, seemed to claim a recognition.

John Nepomucene Neumann was born, on the 28th of March, 1811, in the southwestern part of Bohemia, at the town of Prachatitz, famous for its sufferings at the hands of Liska and his bloodthirsty Hussites. A pious mother imbued him with piety, and, above all, with that childlike devotion to the Blessed Virgin which was his characteristic through life, so clearly defined that the statue erected to him in his native town names him a servant of Mary. His education, begun in his birthplace, was continued at the episcopal city of Budweis. If he did not at first give great promise, it was a trial which he met humbly, and his courage and perseverance triumphed. Father Berger has gathered from Neumann's fellow-students many incidents of his student life. In 1831 he entered the seminary at Budweis, and completed his studies in that of Prague. Here he was remarkable for his piety and learning, and conceived the design of devoting himself to the missions of America. He left his native place in February, 1836, to offer himself to Bishop Kenrick, of Philadelphia, who had solicited, through the Director of the Seminary of Strasburg, young German priests, or theological students. At Strasburg he opened a correspondence with Bishop Brute, but a new trial awaited him. Hopes of the American mission became less definite; but he finally embarked at Havre in the Europa, and, reaching New York, offered himself, through the venerable Father Raffeiner, to Bishop Dubois. He was accepted, to his great joy, and was ordained in St. Patrick's Cathedral in June, 1836. The difficulties around him had been overcome; he was at last a priest, and in a field where a priest had abundant work before him. The first mission assigned to him was Williamsville, in Western New York, with several stations extending to a distance of fifty miles. Father Berger traces his labors in this large district, a rude novitiate for a young priest. After some years of mission life, he felt more and more deeply his call to the religious state. Already in the Seminary he had desired it, and was encouraged by his director to seek admission into the Society of Jesus. In New York he met the Redemptorists, and was strongly prepossessed with their spirit and their work. After long deliberation and prayer he applied, in 1840, for reception among the Sons of St. Alphonsus Liguori. Bishop Hughes, then administrator of the diocese of New York, was loath to lose one of his best priests, but yielded to Rev. Mr. Neumann's desire. He entered the novitiate at Pittsburgh, and in the new life, as a religious, felt that he was at last where God had called him, through many trials. His superiors did not allow him long to enjoy his holy calm. Before long he was engaged in

mission duty at Baltimore, Rochester, New York, and Philadelphia. His abilities, his piety, his prudence, and the sanctity of his whole life, marked him as one destined to do important services for religion. He was made Superior in Pittsburgh, and there he showed so much breadth of judgment and administrative ability that in 1846 he was made Provincial of the order in America. The humble priest who sought no honors was thus placed at the head of the American missions of a congregation of experienced and eloquent priests, among whom he had been but little more than five years. Yet his direction was so wise as to win not only the approval of his superiors and the communities under his care, but, in his frequent intercourse with the archbishops and bishops of the country, he produced on all the impression that he was a superior man, whose influence in a still higher position would be most beneficial.

Archbishop Kenrick had selected the holy rector of St. Alphonsus for his confessor, and frequently consulted him. He had recommended him to the Holy See as in his judgment one of the most worthy priests for the vacant see of Philadelphia. The bishops of the province, especially Bishop O'Connor, of Pittsburgh, were in full accord with the new metropolitan, and the Pope appointed Father Neumann. When the archbishop announced the result to Father Neumann, the tidings came upon him like a clap of thunder. It was totally unexpected; he fell at the feet of Archbishop Kenrick and implored him to relieve him of such a burden. He wrote to his superiors in America and Europe to avert a dignity which was to separate him from his religious brethren and expose him to new and unaccustomed trials. The Redemptorists tried to prevent the issuing of the bulls, but they finally wrote to Father Neumann that their efforts had proved unavailing. The bulls were expedited, and in March reached the holy Redemptorist, accompanied with a strict injunction of obedience. Father Neumann bowed to the will of the Holy Father and submitted. He selected Passion Sunday, 1852, for the ceremony which was to place him among the bishops of the United States, and was consecrated on that day by Archbishop Kenrick, assisted by Bishop Bernard O'Reilly, of Hartford.

On taking possession of his see he addressed a letter to his flock, and selected as his vicar-general the Very Rev. Edward Sourin, who had as administrator governed the diocese during the vacancy. Bishop Neumann's life as Bishop of Philadelphia was one of constant self-denial. The duties of his ministry as a priest, the confessional and the pulpit, a retired cell and the works of sound and sacred learning, were his choice; but he sacrificed his own inclinations, and studied how to meet every want of his dio-

cese. He knew by frequent and real visitations the churches and institutions of his diocese, and stimulated the zeal of his clergy in conferences, where his immense theological learning betrayed itself; exact himself in the prescribed forms of all rites and ceremonies, he endeavored to instil the same feeling in his clergy. Wherever Catholics became numerous enough to form a new parish he encouraged the erection of a church, so that many were added in his time, but in all he counselled prudence and economy. The system of parochial schools was one that he regarded as most essential, and to develop it was his constant and anxious solicitude. All these points were dwelt upon in the diocesan synods which he held, and in which he completed in a manner the great work accomplished by Bishop Kenrick in that diocese, which had been rent by schisms that cooled the charity and shook the faith of many Catholics.

Bishop Neumann was summoned to Rome on the occasion of the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception by Pope Pius IX. in 1854, and after satisfying his devotion by a pilgrimage to Loretto, and other sanctuaries, proceeded to his native place, where his aged father welcomed him with loving joy, and his townspeople with no little pride.

In the Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1852, and the Provincial Council of 1855, his learning and practical knowledge were as fully recognized as his eminently holy life. Then and on other occasions he sought to be relieved from the burden of the episcopate, which he felt daily becoming more and more onerous. Pope Pius IX. did not permit him to resign, but assigned as his coadjutor the Rev. James Frederick Wood, a native of Philadelphia, and at the time a priest in the diocese of Cincinnati. He was consecrated by Archbishop Purcell, at Cincinnati, in April, 1857.

Aided by the coadjutor whom Providence had assigned him, Bishop Neumann felt less anxiety, but he continued his laborious life till the 5th of January, 1860. At that time he did not seem well, and was urged to take advice; but he was cheerful, and after his frugal dinner started to attend some business a short distance from the episcopal residence. On his way the stroke of death came upon him. Feeling his strength depart, he sat down on the nearest steps and almost instantly expired, by a sudden but not unprovided death.

The startling intelligence soon reached his Right Reverend coadjutor and the clergy of his house, and the Catholics of Philadelphia united in deploring their loss.

The reputation of sanctity which Bishop Neumann had in life received new vigor after his death. Not only among the people at large, but among venerable priests and devout religious, there

were many who habitually invoked his intercession. Father Berger details several instances where their prayers were answered. With Bishops Flaget and Baraga he is regarded as a saint, and his body is believed to be incorrupt.

He is a type of hierarchy of the United States; a man great in sacred and secular learning; an untiring missionary; a bishop fully impressed with his great responsibility and anxious to discharge it by guiding his clergy and people, old and young, in the way of salvation, and combining with this a life so pure, so recollected on God, so full of self-denial, as to impress all with his sanctity.

In thus taking by a kind of accident three types, we see the Church in her life in America since its discovery. Whether selected by the monarch of France or Spain, or chosen by the bishops of the country, we see unaltered by time the same faith, the same spirit, the same attachment to the See of Rome, the same love of the unity of the Church, devotion to her discipline, zeal for the sanctification of all committed to their care.

JASPER IN THE APOCALYPSE THE SYMBOL OF THE PRIMACY.

THE task of interpreting any portion of the Apocalypse is proverbially an arduous one. And yet its many difficulties are not without some little alleviation, whose apparent insignificance conveys a wrong idea of their actual value.

Amongst the not very numerous circumstances which happily combine to lighten a little the labor of interpretation may be classed the fact that we can begin our work with this initial certainty, viz., the meaning of St. John is conveyed to us, not directly, but veiled in symbolism. Not that this fact alone will always help us very much; in solving individual problems, however, it often comes in as a very useful factor.

The reason of this occasional utility arises from the necessity we are under of distinguishing in the Apocalypse two kinds of prophetic imagery. There is the imagery which foretells events yet to come, and there is the imagery which simply veils truths already familiar to us. Not that these two classes of symbolism are ordinarily found apart, for more frequently than not they are

intertwined in a way which almost defies unravelling. Hence it happens that while the knowledge that we are dealing with symbolism helps us but little in understanding passages belonging to the first category, it is of material assistance when we are dealing with passages belonging to the second. It is with passages belonging to this second group that our present task deals exclusively.

The twenty-first chapter of the Apocalypse presents us, in some detail, with a description of the celestial city which St. John, in his vision, saw coming down from heaven, and some of these details (mentioned principally in the eleventh, twelfth, eighteenth, and nineteenth verses) form the subject of this present somewhat limited inquiry.

Although all are agreed that the vision of this twenty-first chapter is typical of the Church, there is some difference of opinion as to whether it represents the Church on earth, or as it shall be, finally, triumphant in heaven. As to the relative value of these two interpretations the opinions of commentators are amicably discordant; although opposite they are not conflicting. Hence we may combine both explanations, and understand the vision of the heavenly city to be a figure of the whole Church, not indeed as, at any one time or place, it presents itself to our view, but the Church *as* a whole, freed from the conditions of time and place, and seen from a standpoint higher far than ours. It is a similitude of the Church as we may conceive it appearing, whole and complete, before the eye of its Divine Founder. We see only unfinished portions of the edifice, His glance takes in at one view the slow processes of toilsome labor and the finished work which that labor is gradually accomplishing. No doubt it is not easy to see in the sober, perhaps dull hues, which the Church militant may present to our sight any very pronounced likeness to the brilliant city built of sparkling gems. But we must bear in mind that we are looking at processes, not at the final result. The masons who roughly hewed and laid the foundations of one of our great cathedrals may never have realized the graceful edifice which should one day rise upon those very foundations. And this in some manner exemplifies the thought that should be in our minds when we turn from the city of the vision to the Church in our own day. While we are living out our lives we are looking upon the rough material out of which the city of the vision shall be built. The shapeless blocks lying about seemingly so uncared for are nevertheless the same stones which later on shall form the stately cathedral.

In his description of this city St. John frequently makes mention of jasper, mentioning it with peculiar prominence. Since the

city is symbolical of the Church, since the whole description is symbolical, jasper also must be symbolical of something connected with the Church. It is an emblem; its natural properties and the office it fulfils in the city of the vision typify to us some parallel in the Church. That we may ultimately unravel the emblematic meaning set before us under the name and natural properties of this precious stone, we must begin by knowing something about the stone itself.

It so happens that, in spite of the name, it is not so easy to determine what particular precious stone is meant by "jasper." But we have this negative, certainly, it cannot be the same stone as that which we call "jasper" now. St. John's jasper is translucent, ours is not. Nor do we at first appear to reach any very sharply defined result, if we turn to the various passages in Scripture where the word occurs. In the Apocalypse, the Greek word ἴασπις seems to be used as an equivalent for the Hebrew יָשְׁפֵּה *ya-sh'peh* (not *yashpeh*, as the sound of the word is erroneously given in Mr. Spraker's *Commentary*), a word which occurs only three times in the Old Testament. In Exodus xxviii. 20, and xxxix. 13, the Vulgate, following the Septuagint βήρυλλος, renders the Hebrew word by "beryllus," the beryl. The beryl is closely allied to the emerald, the main difference between the two being the green color of the emerald, and the greater hardness of the beryl. This close affinity between the two, perhaps, explains the dissimilarity of the renderings of יָשְׁפֵּה *ya-sh'peh* in Ezekiel xxviii. 13, for while the Vulgate has "jaspis" as the equivalent, the Septuagint renders the word by σμάραγδος, the emerald. Copyists might possibly be responsible for some change in the order of the precious stones mentioned in this passage. However, taking the texts as they stand, this much may be gleaned from the properties of the beryl and emerald being in some manner predicated of "jasper," viz., that this name is used of some stone, hard as beryl, and translucent as an emerald, and probably of a greenish color. This conclusion, drawn from our consideration of the word as used in the Old Testament, harmonizes fairly well with what we shall gather as to the nature of the "jasper" mentioned in the Apocalypse. It is in the Apocalypse only that the word is found, and there we meet with it four times. In chapter iv. 3, St. John says: "And he that sat was to the sight like jasper . . . . . in sight like to an emerald," if, with Ribera, we couple together the opening and the concluding words of this verse. Supposing those intervening inclosed in a parenthesis, the final words give us the color of the jasper, of which St. John speaks. From its being used to symbolize Him who sat, we may gather the value of the stone, since a stone of inferior value would hardly be chosen as an emblem of one so great. In chapter xxi. 11, jasper

is spoken of as being transparent, "Having the glory of God, and the light thereof like unto a precious stone, as it were to a jasper stone, as crystal."

Here, then, we have some indications of the properties of the jasper of the Scriptures, its value, its color, its transparency. Moreover, from its being mentioned (xxi. 18, 19) as one of the twelve foundation-stones, as well as being itself the stone which formed the mighty wall, we may conclude that it represents some stone pre-eminently firm and enduring.

These properties of jasper form the groundwork of the symbolism whose meaning we wish to ascertain. It is well to bear in mind that we are not engaged in a purely antiquarian investigation, with the one object of finding out what particular precious stone St. John intends to specify under the name of jasper. For our purpose it is sufficient to know the qualities for which the stone has been selected to typify to us, more briefly and more clearly than words could do, the meaning, half concealed, half revealed by the symbolism.

Taking things, then, as they are, we must be content to set out on our voyage of discovery furnished with very simple data. The task before us, arduous as it is for us, would have been easy enough for the early Christians amongst whom St. John lived and wrote. They would have been familiar with the various moral qualities of which an Eastern imagination has made each precious stone a symbol. But for ourselves, we must gather his meaning from the various offices which he assigns to the stones in the structural economy of the city.

One feature of this economy is set before us in the twelfth verse of the twenty-first chapter, where three facts are put prominently before us. We are told (1) that the city coming down from the heavens was defended by a lofty and a mighty wall; (2) that the wall rested upon twelve distinct foundations; and (3) that upon these twelve foundations were the names of the twelve Apostles. We will begin with the consideration of this last-mentioned fact.

It must be remembered that in scriptural phraseology the *name* of a person is used as a compendious emblem of all that the person is, of all that he has become. In the Old Testament, to use a familiar example, we find the name of "Abram," the exalted father, changed by Jehovah Himself into "Abraham," the father of a multitude, that the new name might typify the office and the dignity of the father of the faithful, who should be numberless as the stars of heaven. Similarly, in the New Testament, Simon, "the obedient," is renamed Peter, "the rock." To say, then, that the names of the twelve Apostles are upon the twelve foundation-stones is equivalent to identifying the foundation-stones with the

Apostles themselves, and this imagery is put before us, not casually, but with a clear and definite design. It is not mere accident, it is of set purpose that the twelve foundations are represented as the common foundation of but one wall, inclosing one city. It is of set purpose, that while the Apostles are brought before our notice singly and individually, each one typified by a different precious stone, they are also represented as indissolubly connected with the one encircling wall. But of this later.

Assuming, then, as we are fully justified in doing, that the twelve foundations typify the twelve Apostles, we pass on to inquire, are the Apostles here represented in any definite order? The analogy of other passages in which all the Apostles are mentioned gives us the best method of answering which the nature of the case admits of. Turning to the passages which enumerate all the Apostles, we find that though there is some slight variation as to the precedence of the other Apostles among themselves, the first place is always assigned to Simon Peter. St. Matthew begins his list (x. 2) by saying, categorically, "The first [πρῶτος] is Simon, who is called Peter." St. Mark, though it almost seems as if he had not originally intended to give a catalogue, and had only accidentally glided off into giving a list of the Apostles in consequence of having mentioned that the name of Peter, "the rock," was "put upon" (ἐπέθηκεν) Simon, yet he too also follows what seems to have been the recognized order among the Apostles, certainly with respect to St. Peter (iii. 16), and mentions him first. So too with St. Luke (vi. 13, 14); since he gives the last place to the unhappy Apostle who, in public estimation, in some sense deserved the last place, we may argue *à pari*, that he gives the first place also in accordance with public estimation: "And He chose twelve of them, whom also he named Apostles, Simon, whom He surnamed Peter." In this way, then, we find that there is an unvarying order preserved, at least with respect to St. Peter, when all the Apostles are mentioned together, and in the complete absence of any argument proving a departure from this unvarying order, we arrive at the conclusion that in the passage in the Apocalypse now under consideration, this same order is tacitly understood.

The twelve foundation-stones typify the twelve Apostles, and under the symbol of the foundation-stone of jasper, the first among the foundation-stones, St. John presents us with an emblem of the first among the Apostles,—St. Peter. The prominence which the Apocalypse gives to the symbol of St. Peter is fully in keeping with the prominence with which St. Peter himself is set before us in the Gospels. The Apocalypse carries on in symbolism the *same ideas* which are more plainly expressed in the Gospels, as an example or two will prove.

The city of the vision was girt about with a high wall (v. 12), and this wall was of jasper (v. 18). Now jasper not only serves as a foundation-stone equally with the other eleven stones, but it moreover so encompases the whole, that while parts of the city do not rest on one or another of the individual foundation-stones, there is absolutely no portion which is not girded and defended by the one wall of jasper. If we call upon our imagination to picture to us a city resting upon foundations of various colors, but the whole surrounded by one high encircling wall of jasper, would it be strange if we gathered the impression that jasper, being the most prominent, was *the* stone of the city? Compare this symbolism of St. John with the symbol used by our Lord Himself to typify the office of the first of the Apostles.

Amongst his brethren, Simon was singled out to be surnamed "The Rock," *the* stone par excellence. For though, in the Greek, there is a distinction and a difference between the word, λίθος, a stone, used in the Apocalypse, and the word, πέτρα, a large stone, a rock, used in the Gospel, there is no such difference of meaning in the Syriac word, Kipho[1] (whence κῆφας = πέτρος), probably used by our Lord, which means equally a rock or a stone, and is also employed with another noun to designate *precious* stones, exactly as St. John employs the Greek word, λίθος, stone. This word St. John, whose native language was Syro-Chaldaic, may have had in his mind, when writing of the "jasper stone." Be this as it may, it is not mere airy imagination to see in the vision of St. John a further application of the same symbol—the same word—originally chosen by our Lord to typify the office of Simon —the Rock. In the Gospel and in the Apocalypse, the firm unyielding stone is used as typical of the office, which one of the Apostles should fulfil in the economy of the Church.

There is another coincidence, which gives strength to this conclusion. The main purpose for which the walls of a city are raised is that they may guard and protect. Now, the command given to Simon Peter (John xxi.) is by no means adequately represented by the ordinary English rendering of the original Greek words, "ποίμαινε τὰ πρόβατά μου." Perhaps no English word can fully convey the whole meaning of ποίμαινε, embodying, as it does, an Eastern, and not a Western, idea. Of course, it means "feed my sheep," but it also means much more. It means, tend them, guard them, guide them to good pastures, watch them by day and protect them by night; in short, it means all that an Eastern shepherd is expected to do in keeping the flock committed to his charge.[2] In the Gos-

[1] Of Castell's Lexicon Syriacum, s. v.

[2] In the Land and The Book (Thompson) there is a good description of a shepherd's life and duties, pp. 203-206: "The sheep are so tame that they follow their

pel, it is the office of Peter the Shepherd to guard and protect the whole flock, and to guard and protect the whole city is equally the office of Peter—the firm rock of jasper—in the Apocalypse.

It is difficult to give an explanation of symbolism which may not seem fanciful. All symbolism appeals to our imagination, and our imagination must naturally be the first to respond to this appeal. But our test of the correctness of any interpretation must be the naturalness and the ease with which that interpretation corresponds with doctrines elsewhere definitely proposed to us. Let us see how our interpretation stands this test.

If we had to choose some imagery which should set before us the doctrine of the primacy of St. Peter, typifying to us an authority coextensive with the limits of the Church herself, we could hardly choose better imagery than that which is presented to us by a firm high wall, completely encompassing a whole city. The strength of the city is really the strength of the city's wall. It is the wall which, so to speak, communicates the strength to the city. The office of that Apostle, for whom individually our Lord prayed, who was commanded to confirm, "to strengthen" his brethren, is evidently to communicate his qualities to the whole Church. This office, too, is meant to be permanent, as the walls of the city are meant to be permanent. Again, if we wished to show how their strength of apostolic authority, though possessed in some measure by individual bishops, is equally possessed, not independently, but only in virtue of the firm union with the principal possessor of that apostolic authority, we could hardly select a better picture for our imagination than is shown us in the imagery of many foundation-stones, each distinct, indeed, but firmly united among themselves, and each and every one indissolubly conjoined with the one encircling wall, which incloses the whole city.

It is not only on the firm enduring wall of the emblematic city that jasper is put before us. In the 11th verse it is said that this city "had the glory of God, and the light thereof like unto a precious stone, as it were to a jasper stone, as crystal." To explain this verse we must collate it with the 23d of the same chapter, where we are told that the city had no need of sun or moon, for "the glory of God illuminates it." It seems at first as if two different sources of light are indicated in verses 11 and 23, but if the

keeper. . . . It is his business to find pastures for them. . . . They must be taught to follow, and not to stray into the unfenced fields of corn which lie so temptingly on either side. The shepherd calls from time to time. . . . They know his voice and follow on, but, if a stranger calls, they turn and flee. . . . The shepherd goes before, not merely to point out the way, but to see that it is practicable and safe. He is armed, in order to defend his charge. . . . And when the thief and robber come, the faithful shepherd has often to put his life in his hand to guard his flock. I have known more than one case in which he had literally to lay it down in the contest."

two passages be considered a little more attentively, it will be found that they both refer ultimately to the same illumination. In verse 23 we are told that the brilliancy of God enlightens the city; in verse 11 the same truth is conveyed in a slightly different form and with some additional particulars. In both passages it is stated that the glory of God is "the light," but in verse 11 we are further informed as to the *medium* by which this light is transmitted to the city. This meaning is not so very well brought out in the ordinary translation, and for this reason. The word φωστήρ, usually translated by "light" or "luminary," has two meanings. Primarily it signifies a *source of light*, a substance which of itself gives forth light. But a source of light may often be only the *means* by which light is not originated, but simply transmitted, and hence φωστήρ has the secondary or metaphorical meaning of a medium by which light may penetrate—a window. Translators have usually preferred to give the primary meaning, but the secondary seems to be the one intended by St. John, for this reason, *inter alia*. Since "the light" has already been mentioned, and this light (δόξα) is more fully insisted upon in verse 23 as being exclusively all-sufficient, we are doing no violence to the sacred text if we understand φωστήρ in verse 11 in its secondary or metaphorical sense, conceiving it to convey the idea of *the means* by which the light, already mentioned in the opening words of verse 11, passes on to be diffused over the city. This rendering makes the whole context more clear and consistent. The context is certainly more consistent, because if the Lamb (verse 23) is the lamp, the real light-giver of the city, and the glory of God which flows from the Lamb is its brilliant all-sufficient light, it is in open opposition to verse 23 to give the city another "light-giver," another *source* of light, in verse 11. But there is no opposition if we understand the φωστήρ, the "luminary" of verse 11, as the *medium* which simply transmits light, and there is greater propriety in the figure employed, for while there is no incongruity in comparing the medium, through which light passes, to a transparent jewel, a transparent jewel is hardly a very fit image of the actual origin of the light itself.

In speaking of the luminary (that is, the medium by which the light of which St. John speaks is spread over the city), it is said to be "as jasper." If this stone is chosen, we are compelled to suppose that St. John had a definite reason for choosing jasper rather than another precious stone. We gather from verses 19 and 20, where the names of twelve precious stones are given, that he was not driven to call the stone "jasper" from want of familiarity with the names of other gems or jewels. Having then a plentiful vocabulary from which to choose, it is only bare justice to suppose that he intentionally selected the stone which was most suited to con-

vey his emblematic meaning. Jasper, it has been shown, is the emblem under which we are to recognize the person and the office of St. Peter, and we are justified in supposing that the same meaning is shadowed forth here by the same symbol which has just been employed for this purpose in a passage so closely connected with this one, not only locally, but also in signification.

This imagery, by which jasper is shown to be the medium, and not itself the primary originator, of the light, corresponds without any strain with the doctrine of the Catholic Church as to the special teaching office of the first among the Apostles, St. Peter. In the economy of the Church, it is the permanent office of the Supreme Pontiff to transmit to the faithful the light of that truth which comes from God. It is not his office to originate light, but he is divinely appointed and divinely helped to transmit the light which is in the Scriptures and tradition. The light indeed exists independently of him, but it is not intended that it should reach the city of the Church by any other instrumentality than her. In the symbolism which conveys this truth we see that the light of God's brilliancy is not intended to reach the city by any other means, except through the jasper medium. The providence of God might have provided for the teaching of His Church in other ways, so too might other emblems have been selected. But taking things as they are, this idea of an appointed medium for the transmission of the light of truth is not a mere invention made to suit a preconceived interpretation. It is only a natural continuation, or rather development, of our Lord's own phraseology. The Lamb, which, in the Apocalypse, is the luminary of the city, is a figure of the Messias, who, in the Gospel, said of Himself that He was the light of the world. And yet, being Himself the light, He nevertheless said to His disciples (Mathew v. 14), "*You* are the light of the world," not because they were the originators of the light, but because they, not others, were the chosen means by which "the light" was to be diffused through all time and through all regions of the earth. None of the disciples could be called "the light," because they were to be the means of transmitting the light, in their measure and degree; with still greater propriety can the first and foremost amongst all the disciples be held up to us as "the light," the medium *par excellence* for communicating the light.

The imagery of the Apocalypse, therefore, is in perfect concord with the metaphorical language of our Lord in the Gospel; both the imagery and the metaphor find their realization in the doctrines of the Catholic Church, and in these matters such harmony must not be dismissed as being purely and simply an accidental coincidence.

These explanations will, no doubt, have to meet the objection that they wander off too much into minutiæ. But this is an unreasonable and unreasoning objection. There is no reason *a priori* why minutiæ should not be enveloped in figurative language as well as matters which may seem to us more worthy of such treatment. Nothing is small in the eyes of Him to whom nothing is great; and how are we to judge of relative importance here? If we make comparisons with other dispensations of God, we find the same infinite wisdom which gives laws to regulate in their orbits the mighty suns which shine upon us from the heavens as far-off stars, also frames the laws which order the growth and well-being of the smallest microscopic bacillus which lives and dies unnoticed upon a blade of grass. In the symbolism of the Apocalypse, as elsewhere, we are to deduce reasonable conclusions from reasonable premises; we must not take our prejudices and our disinclinations as our guide. It is as reasonable deductions from the given data that the conclusions here enunciated are put forward. The imagery of the city and of the stones, it is contended, was chosen with a definite object. The explanations which have been given show, with unavoidable brevity, the parallelism which exists between the teaching conveyed (1) in the metaphorical language of the Apocalypse; (2) in the symbolism of the Gospel; and (3) in the doctrines of the Catholic Church. From this agreement it is argued that the points of coincidence are too numerous, too minute, and converging, and at the same time too mutually consistent to be merely the unforeseen result of fortuitous chance.

LAWLESSNESS AND LAW IN IRELAND.

A PECULIAR feature in Irish national movements is the character of special lawlessness which is constantly attributed to them by English public opinion. In other countries the distinction between political offences and men's crimes is readily recognized. Kossuth or Daniel Mannin might be rebels against the Austrian rule, but they were never regarded as criminals on that account. Even Washington, though officially a traitor in the view of English law, was never looked on in the same light as a cut-throat or a burglar. In Ireland, however, the case is different. Whether her people array themselves against the foreign government in armed insurrection, or in legal agitation, they are alike regarded by English public opinion as actual criminals. From the earliest days of the Norman invasion down to the present time disaffection to the English government has been regarded in Irishmen as simple lawlessness. Indeed that character is attached even more persistently to movements within the bounds of legality than to armed rebellion. It was so in O'Connell's time, and it is still more so in the recent movement under the guidance of Mr. Parnell. The usual practice with the English public is to attribute every crime occurring in Ireland to political causes, and from that supposition to identify Irish politics with pure and simple lawlessness. The officials and their dependents in Ireland re-echo the cry, and thus an impression is often made in other countries of a peculiarly lawless character in the Irish people. How far such a character is deserved will best be shown by a detailed examination of the law itself now existing in Ireland.

That a people is not necessarily lawless because it resists unjust laws need scarcely be shown. Tyranny can make victims; it cannot make criminals. The Bulgarians massacred a few years ago by the Turkish Bashi Bazouks were not a lawless people because they incurred the ban of the Sultan's law. The bishops and priests of Prussia, who were sent to prison for refusing obedience to the Falk laws, were not, therefore, to be regarded as lawless men. If, too, the existing laws of Ireland be not of such a character as to command public respect rightfully, opposition to them cannot be styled lawlessness. The distinction between crimes and legal offences is well known to the Irish people, though the efforts to confuse the two on the part of the government are unceasing. Thus quite lately a judge in Ireland, Lawson, stated that the employment of a man to set a bone who was not a regular surgeon was an instance of the utter lawlessness of the people of Tippe-

rary. The natural result is that the bulk of the people hold aloof from the administration of the law; and this, again, is regarded in England as a convincing proof of the lawless nature of the Celtic mind. Whether it be not rather a proof of the injustice of the laws themselves can best be told by examining their nature and administration. It must be remembered that, though in theory Ireland is an integral part of the British empire, its laws are different essentially from those of England. In England the laws are suited to the will of the country; in Ireland they are adapted to the will of a foreign country. That such should be the case is an essential part of the system imposed on Ireland by the union.

The distinction between the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of government is much less clearly marked in the United Kingdom than it is in the United States. Parliament not only makes laws, but changes the executive in the persons of the ministry almost at will; and, moreover, in the House of Lords it forms the High Court of Appeal. That such a concentration of powers in the hands of a single body should be injurious to its efficiency is obvious; but to what an extent the centralizing system is carried would be very inadequately conceived did we merely think Parliament undertook for the British empire the functions of President, Congress, and Supreme Court in the United States. It assumes, in addition, all the duties which are discharged in the United States by the State governments, and even many which here are delegated to counties and municipalities. Thus a railroad cannot be built, a river deepened, or a university established in Ireland, without the special permission of Parliament. To act without it in such cases is illegal. When we consider how much of daily life needs the constant interference of law in the shape it is given by Federal, State, and county governments, and remember that Ireland is absolutely dependent for such interference on the leisure of a single legislature, charged, moreover, with the administration of the British empire, it is easy to realize how plentiful must be the crop of necessary illegality in Ireland.

The slowness with which the most needed changes are effected in Irish legislation under the present system is something astounding. Catholic emancipation was granted in 1829, but it was forty-three years later before the marriage of Catholics with Protestants ceased to be a criminal act for a priest, and unbinding on the parties in law. The dietary which can legally be given to the poor in workhouses was fixed during the famine years of 1846–49, at a scale scarcely above starvation, as a matter of immediate necessity. It has remained unaltered since, though the necessities of the time have passed away for over thirty years. The level of water to be maintained in the Shannon was fixed fifty years ago at six and a

half feet for supposed needs of navigation. It has since been established that four feet is ample for the only class of traffic on it, yet the old level is continued, with the result of flooding thousands of acres, and hindering the drainage of a tenth of the whole island. The evil is admitted, but Parliament has no time to interfere, and it would be illegal to attempt action without its sanction. These are but a few, and by no means the most striking, instances of the neglect of Irish legislation during the present century. Whenever Irish measures have to contend not with mere indifference, but with hostile prejudice, the case is far worse. The justice of providing university education for Catholics, as it had been provided for Protestants in Ireland, was admitted in theory at the time of the union, but it was only two years ago that any practical attempt was made to admit the students of Catholic colleges to legal equality with all others. The absolute need of reform in the land laws was pointed out by a Parliamentary commission forty years ago, but it was not until three millions of the population had been driven from the country, and after the most terrible famine known in modern Europe, that any attempt, however slight, was made to change the system.

Fatal as such a leaden rule of changeless neglect amid the rapid changes of modern life would be of necessity to any country, its evils in Ireland are aggravated tenfold by the nature of the system that preceded it. Where not directly changed by Parliament, the present government of Ireland is simply a perpetuation of the infamous penal code and Protestant ascendency of the last century. The avowed aim of that system was to debase intellectually and ruin materially the Irish Catholics—that is to say, more than three-fourths of the nation. In its material effects that system is still, to an enormous extent, continued. The practical administration of the country is still kept in the hands of the same class. The worst laws of the penal code are liable to be applied at their will in a manner which would startle Americans, who believe that such enactments have long passed into oblivion. Thus, within the last ten years, Chief Justice Whiteside laid down the law that the whole organization of the Catholic Church in Ireland is still illegal under the statutes of Queen Elizabeth. But even the penal code itself is not the only relic of past misgovernment that still sways the laws of Ireland. During the past year Irish ladies were committed to jail as felons under laws enacted in the reign of Edward the Third to meet local labor troubles in England. Time, place, or character is no bar to the application of any law to the Irish people. Even the legislation of Strafford, a legislation for which his own life was solemnly forfeited by the judgment of the English Parliament, two hundred and forty years ago, has been lately resusci-

tated by the Irish lawyers, and Irish members of Parliament are called on to suffer imprisonment by virtue of that legislation. Let us imagine Louisiana governed by the lettres de cachet of the Regent Orleans, or New York by the Star Chamber decrees of Charles the First, and we will have a fair idea of what is now the actual state of the law in Ireland.

That under a system so chaotic, and clothed with powers claimed at any period during the past seven centuries, the authority of the executive should be virtually despotic is inevitable. In Ireland, however, the despotism of the Lord Lieutenant is tempered in an entirely peculiar way. The government of Louis the Fifteenth in France was said to be "despotism limited by epigrams." In Ireland the system is "despotism limited by official boards." Public education, the relief of the poor, the police of the country, its public works, and its land administration are all controlled by boards of irresponsible officials holding power for life, and having "vested rights" to their places, from which even a Lord Lieutenant is powerless to disturb them. The liberty of every private citizen is at his mercy, but he dare not meddle with the vested rights of an official to live at the public expense, however inefficient or injurious his action may be to the public weal. The administration of the law itself is no exception to the general rule. Judges, prosecutors, and legal functionaries of every class, from the Lord Chancellor to the lowest bailiff, are drawn from a small class of the population, whose special mark is hostility to the popular feelings of the country. That the people must be always in the wrong when opposed to the government is a cardinal principle in the mind of Irish judges. The mere trial of crimes is but a small portion of their administration of the law. It seems to be regarded as part of their duty to condemn from the bench, in season and out of season, all popular movements of a political kind. How far such a course tends to promote respect for the law, or confidence in its administration, may well be judged. Combined with the principles on which the judges are chosen, and the general character of the bar, it has certainly produced among the great majority of the population a belief that the law is little more than a machinery of injustice used by a foreign and hostile government for their oppression. How far this belief is reasonable may best be judged from an examination of the composition of the Irish judiciary and the system under which its members are appointed to render equal justice to all members of the community.

That the administrators of the law as far as possible should be impartial between all classes, and especially between the government and the people, and that they should be independent in the discharge of their functions, are principles recognized in all lands.

How far they are regarded in the appointment of judges in Ireland the facts themselves will best tell. Those functionaries are certainly numerous enough, and their pay is out of all proportion large compared to the circumstances of the country. Twenty-four judges of first instance discharge the work of the law in England. In Ireland with one-fourth of the population and a tenth of the legal business, twenty-one are employed for that purpose. The Lord Chancellor of Ireland is the chief of the judiciary. His salary is forty thousand dollars a year. His judicial work is practically nothing. The grounds on which he is appointed are wholly political services to one of the parties in England. He enters on his office with a change in the English ministry, and retires on the downfall of his patrons. To secure him against any risk of leaning towards the popular feelings, however, it is provided that on quitting office he shall enjoy a pension of twenty thousand dollars annually for life. The late Sir Joseph Napier, who was made chancellor in 1857, though physically incapable from deafness of discharging judicial duties, thus received a pension during twenty-five years amounting altogether to just half a million of dollars for one year's inactivity in office. Violent partisanship was the sole qualification which procured him his position and its emoluments. The maintenance of "Protestant Ascendency in Church and State," in spite of Emancipation, was his chief claim to notice, and it may be imagined how favorably such a doctrine recommended his legal decisions to the respect of the Irish people.

The eight judges who admininister equity, admiralty and probate law, are appointed on the same grounds as the Chancellor, but hold their offices permanently once appointed. Their salaries range from seven thousand five hundred to twenty thousand dollars a year, promotion in all cases being wholly dependent on the favor of the ministry. It is not uncommon for judges to receive other paid appointments as commissioners of various kinds outside their judicial ones. The average earnings of members of the Irish Bar are comparatively small. Five thousand dollars a year is much above the average of private practice, and we believe none exceeds ten thousand at present. Thus the numerous judgeships are naturally the great objects of pursuit of the lawyers in Ireland. The barristers from whose ranks the judiciary is exclusively drawn are not numerous. We believe those in practice amount to about four hundred. The expenses of entering the profession are heavy, the prospects of success in it small unless by official favor. As a double result the great majority are drawn from a small class of the population, chiefly landed proprietors and officials. Thus by class feelings and interest the bar is closely drawn towards the government, and at the same time imbued with strong feelings of

hostility towards any popular movements calculated to change the existing order of affairs. As the right of pleading in the higher courts is strictly reserved to barristers, it may be conceived how their character as a body promotes the feeling of confidence in the law among the mass of the people. Indeed, of late years, it is all but impossible for a barrister to obtain a place in Parliament from any constituency in Ireland. Above all other classes they are regarded as the most specially venal and corrupt by the majority of the population. But if they are excluded from popular respect, they are compensated by a complete monopoly of the administration of justice such as it is in Ireland.

It might, perhaps, be considered that the composition of the bar and the disposal of judicial preferments, according to the favor of the ministry, would be amply sufficient to secure the devotion of the judges to the government as against the people. A peculiar test, however, unknown elsewhere, is usually required for a seat among the twelve judges of common law who form the highest tribunal in Ireland. The rule for these appointments, which have salaries attached ranging from seventeen to twenty-five thousand dollars a year, is, that something more is required than ordinary partisan attachment to an English party. The first step to a judgeship is the office of public prosecutor. The Attorney-General and Solicitor-General represent the executive in all legal affairs. By the system of government in England they are also obliged to have seats in Parliament, and to defend the ministry against all attacks on their policy. An exclusively one-sided advocacy in the courts, and an unqualified adherence to the policy of a particular minister in Parliament, are thus the legal duties of an Irish Attorney-General. From the discharge of those functions he is transferred to the judicial bench as a matter of course. In Parliament the future judges are required strictly to support the ministry in every change of policy with much greater subservience than is expected from an ordinary member of the party. In fact for either of them to oppose the Prime Minister on any serious point would involve the necessity of resignation, and, of course, put him out of the line of promotion to the bench. Besides these Parliamentary duties, the Attorney-General and Solicitor-General have to act as prosecutors in all important public cases, especially of a political nature. These are constantly occurring in Ireland. The prosecution of O'Connell in 1844, those of Smith O'Brien, Mitchell, and the other Young Ireland leaders in 1848, 1849 and 1850; the Fenian trials between 1865 and 1868, the Parnell affair in 1880, and the Land League trials during the past year, were all directed or managed by those functionaries. As in all the public sentiment was on the side of the accused parties, it is not unnatural

that the public prosecutors acquired the reputation of hostility to the national feelings of the country, and that the same reputation should attach to them after their elevation to the judicial bench. In fact the great majority of the judges are looked on as more decidedly partisans of one or other of the English parties than are the mere members of Parliament, either Whig or Tory. However, the government treats them with great deference, and manifests the utmost disinclination to express any dissatisfaction with their acts as a matter of principle. So far is this carried that a few years ago, a judge of more than usual unpopularity, who had made his way to the bench by first vigorously proclaiming his bitter hostility to the government of the day, and then suddenly joining it on a moment's notice, was maintained in his position after he had exhibited strong marks of insanity. Respect for the judicial character prevented the government from interfering with his judgments until he attempted to cut his valet's throat. He was thereupon retired with expressions of sincere regret at the unfortunate circumstances which made an interference with a judge necessary. For minor instances of eccentricity almost absolute immunity is assured by the respectful deference of the government to the majesty of the law. The contrast between the feelings manifested towards the bench by the official class and the people generally is one of the strange features of Irish life.

The mode in which legal patronage apart from their pay is vested in the judges in Ireland is a strong proof of the confidence reposed in their integrity by the government. The registrar of each court is appointed by the judge. As an almost invariable rule, he is a near relative, a son, or a brother, if such exists. The immediate relatives of judges practicing in their courts, are usually favored with much larger employment than other members of the bar of like standing. For the various commissionerships and other posts distributed from time to time by the government, the sons and brothers of judges have usual prior claims. In other countries these things would excite remark, but under existing circumstances in Ireland they are regarded by the Bar as a matter of course and a powerful means of making the administration of the law respected. The necessity of the administrators of the law and their families being raised socially above the general population is recognized freely by the whole official class, as is also the practical fact that high pay is the most effectual means to attain that end. On this point, however, the public feeling is not wholly in accord with that of the official world. Cases have been known lately, in which a judge, receiving twenty thousand dollars a year, was burned in effigy before his own court, and was commonly described as a perjured scoundrel. The only grounds for the charge, however, was

that he had sworn with due solemnity not to accept office from a particular government, in public. The oath was not taken in a court of law, and consequently no charge of perjury could be legally brought against his lordship. The popular prejudice, however, against him was singularly bitter, and it did much to lessen the respect which it was intended by government should under all circumstances surround the functions of a superior judge.

The judges (as they are usually styled by eminence), whom we have been describing, do not number over five per cent. of the active members of the Irish Bar. Even reckoning their registrars and other officials, they would not be over one-tenth of the legal fraternity eligible for the offices. A second grade of judges has in consequence been established, who were formerly known as county chairmen, but now as county judges. They number thirty-four, with salaries ranging from three thousand five hundred to eleven thousand dollars a year. The latter is enjoyed by the Recorder of Dublin, who conducts the police court of that city with much the same jurisdiction as a police judge in New York. The functions of the other county judges are not very heavy. They sit on an average one day in each week. Three hours a day is considered heavy judicial work by the Irish Bar. Their jurisdiction is not defined very accurately, as in certain cases they can even sentence to death. A few years ago a chairman in a southern county discovered a statute which enabled him to pass a capital sentence for the slaying of a goat. That class of animal, it may be said incidentally, is usually believed to have been overlooked in the ordinary law of England. However, appeals lie in most cases to the higher courts from the county judges, and when they transact much business, appeals are common. A chairman in Ulster in 1872 furnished fifty-one appeals from his court in a single session. The origin of the office of county judge is due to Lord Clare at the beginning of the present century. The Irish Bar was strongly opposed to the union with England, and in 1798 it protested, by a hundred and sixty-two to thirty-two voices, against that measure. Lord Clare immediately established thirty-two county chairmanships, as there were not judgeships enough to provide for all the minority. Sixteen of the new offices were in fact given among the thirty-two, who were thus consoled for the popular ill feeling which attended the sale of Irish Legislative Independence. The offices have been since continued as a useful provision for partisans of the government whose services are not sufficiently important to qualify them for a judgeship, and who would find it hard to make a livelihood by private practice. The public sentiment with regard to this class of judges is not very strong. It corresponds indeed tolerably closely with the judgment expressed by Dante in his Inferno

on the class of the condemned prisoners there, who were "neither for God nor against Him, but for themselves:"

"Let us not speak of them but look and pass."

Like the higher judges, they are appointed exclusively for political partisanship or sometimes as a mere mark of official favor, and they are naturally strongly opposed to popular ideas in politics, social and national life.

The administration of the law in smaller matters than those which engage the county courts, is in the hands of the justices of the peace, or magistrates, as they are usually styled. Their powers are much the same as those of justices in the United States, but they inflict much heavier punishments than are usually awarded in courts of the same class outside Ireland. Imprisonment for six or nine months or a year is quite a usual sentence in a magistrate's court. The magistracy numbers several thousands, and several of them usually come together to hold the Courts of Petty Sessions. No pay is attached to the office, as the power it confers causes it to be sought rather eagerly by the class of country gentlemen who have interests in the local administration of justice. It also confers the right of taking part in the Poor and Law Boards on an equal footing with the elected guardians, and in this way gives the magistracy a share in the small amount of local patronage that might otherwise be distributed among the mere tax-payers. The magistrates are appointed by the Lord Chancellor at discretion, and are liable to be removed by him at pleasure. In practice, however, they are seldom struck off the roll, unless for acts, either personal or political, disagreeable to the executive. Mere illegalities in the discharge of their functions, or even trifling offences against the law in other respects, are not considered sufficient cause, except in extraordinary circumstances, for the interference of government with the judicial acts of magistrates. The law must be respected in its administrators, even if administered a little irregularly, is the rule adopted by the government on such occasions. No legal knowledge is required for appointment as a magistrate. It is usually required, however, that he shall be chosen from what is officially regarded as the upper class of society.

The peculiar quality denoted officially by the term "respectability" is somewhat hard for Americans to comprehend; without a due understanding of it, however, it is almost impossible to appreciate the principles on which the administration of local justice is conducted in Ireland. Education, professional standing, personal character, or wealth, are not the grounds on which a man is held respectable in the eyes of the law. It is indeed supposed that these qualifications are mainly confined to a small class of the population. This class was formerly defined by law as the Protestant ascendency,

and meant only that portion of the population which was willing to take the sacrament in an Episcopalian church, and to swear that Catholicity was damnable and idolatrous. It numbered about a ninth of the population and enjoyed a monopoly of all official patronage. Since Catholic Emancipation, the legal character of the old test has been abolished, and the quondam "ascendency" continues to hold together chiefly by its hold on public offices. The State Church helped to maintain it down to 1870, and in its capacity of "the respectable class" it has drawn to it a small number of Catholics, chiefly officials, and a certain number of the northern Presbyterians, who were formerly excluded from the "legal Protestants" ranks. This body forms the element from which the magistrates and other "respectable" functionaries are almost exclusively taken. Episcopalians, however, of national leanings in politics are strictly excluded from the ranks of the official "respectables," as of course are all Catholics who are not avowedly devoted to the government. Thus an Episcopalian who has no very definite political leanings is officially looked on as respectable, while a Catholic of the same kind would be assumed to be of the other class. If, however, an Irish Catholic should devote himself to either party in England, and repudiate any sympathy with his own country, his religion alone would not prevent the government from recognizing his respectability. This short explanation may clear up many difficulties in the way of understanding why magistrates are appointed to dispense the law to the Irish people.

Though the ownership of land is not essential as a condition to an appointment, in practice the majority of magistrates in the rural districts are either landlords or agents. Owing to the former action of the Penal laws, indeed, most of the Irish landlords belong to the Episcopalian body, and on that ground are legally "respectable." Among the legally respectable ranks, however, the government prefers landlords, as the most naturally suited to render impartial justice from the bench. Shopkeepers and farmers, it is thought, would be liable to bias in favor of their own class, and therefore pretty universally excluded. So long as a magistrate is not national in his politics the government does not pay as much attention to his party as it does in the case of paid judges. Three per cent. of the present magistrates of Ireland are Catholics. The latter form seventy-eight per cent. of the population. The government, however, denies that any reason for complaint exists, and fully admits the principle that Catholics have equal rights to office on the bench as any other class of the community. It attributes their practical exclusion to strange "coincidences" over which it had no control. The popular prejudice attributes it to the same intolerance which prevailed openly

in former years in the body from which the administrators of the law are still chiefly drawn.

The method in which justice is administered at petty sessions is little less peculiar than the composition of the judiciary. As a general rule, the respectability of the parties coming into court voluntarily or otherwise has great weight with the decisions given. This is perhaps only natural, considering the limited legal knowledge of the average magistrate, and his invariable respectability. A respectable man is generally supposed to be incapable of committing crime. If an act of his look criminal, magistrates endeavor to find reasonable grounds for doubt. Thus, last year, an excitable gentleman who drew a loaded revolver at a public meeting and brandished it was fined five dollars, on the ground that he was under the influence of Irish whisky. A short time previously, a man who drew a revolver in a county court, and who was mentally deranged, got seven years' imprisonment with hard labor in the penitentiary. The first was a respectable man, the latter only a public teacher.

The manner in which what would elsewhere be looked on as rather serious charges are dismissed by the magistrates, when brought against persons of their own class or public officials, is a marked feature in the administration of the law in Ireland. A couple of instances out of several reported during the past year may serve as good examples of the practice. A man driving home at evening near Limerick, towards the close of the year, nearly ran over two men who were searching for some money one of them had dropped in the roadway. The searchers cried out, and the gentleman driving at once fired a couple of shots at them, but, luckily, in vain. On being brought before a magistrate's court he was at once excused, on the statement that he did not know but the men were about to attack him. He was an officer in the army. A similar case occurred some time previously at Baltinglass, near Dublin, where an Episcopalian clergyman fired two or three shots on the streets after a runaway who had jostled him. The reverend gentleman explained that he had only fired to notify the police of his own whereabouts, and was at once discharged, while the boy was severely reprimanded. The respectability of the parties in both cases was deemed ample justification. The penalty on a farmer or mechanic for a similar act would have probably been about seven years' penal servitude. In such a case the legal term for the act would have been attempt to kill. As the majority of magistrates count policemen, bailiffs and gentlemen's servants for legal purposes among the respectable classes, there is very little legal crime charged to that portion of the community. Among the bulk of the population, however, there is a tendency

to regard legal offences as quite distinct from real crimes. This tendency, however, is more commonly set down by the magistracy to a peculiar quality of the Celtic mind, differing from that of other races, rather than to anything connected with the administration of the law. Its origin, in fact, is officially considered to be ethnological, and not legal; consequently, though its existence is deplored, it is deemed useless to attempt to remove it.

An important element among the magistrates are the residents or stipendiaries. They are drawn from the same class and possess much the same jurisdiction as the ordinary justices, but they receive pay from the government, and are required to reside in the districts assigned to each. From these districts they are liable to be moved to others at the will of the Lord-Lieutenant. There are usually two or three in a county, and the position is much sought after by country gentlemen of limited means and no special profession. In the justices' courts they have a superiority over the ordinary magistrates, and as, besides, they are expected to attend regularly, while the others merely come when they please or are specially interested in cases to be tried, the stipendiaries naturally wield much greater power in the country. The government communicates with them as with direct agents; and, besides their judicial functions, they also have the power of giving or refusing various privileges to members of the community generally. The right to keep arms is one of these privileges, the granting or refusing of which is left to the discretion of the resident magistrates. In granting it they are not required to confine themselves to legal grounds. They can be guided by the applicant's private conduct towards personal friends or similar reasons. Thus a case was mentioned to us as a perfectly normal one in which license to keep his gun was refused to a farmer because he owed rent to his landlord, the latter being a friend to the licensing magistrate. Another power enjoyed by the residents at the present time is that of sending police to search the houses of obnoxious individuals, either by day or night, at discretion, and of arresting any strangers in his district. The latter may be punished by six months' imprisonment if suspected by the residents of unlawful designs, the nature of which need not be defined. Persons residing in the district are liable to a similar jurisdiction if found out-of-doors after nightfall. However, these provisions are only put in force against persons of the farming, artisan and laboring classes, and even but rarely against them. Jail accommodation is somewhat limited in Ireland.

No legal training is required of the stipendiaries, and, in fact, military antecedents are an ordinary preparation for such an appointment. However, there is no necessity for any qualifications,

as the stipendiaries are appointed entirely through political influence. They usually hold for life, and are pensioned after a certain number of years, but, if their conduct on the bench be disagreeable to the Executive, the Lord-Lieutenant can remove them to remote districts, or even retire them. In cases involving only the rights of individuals, however, the government very rarely uses either punishment. In such cases the principle of judicial independence is respected by the authorities. Besides their judicial functions, the stipendiaries have control of the police, and are often placed in command of the military when their services are deemed necessary. The breaking up or prevention of public meetings prohibited by the Lord-Lieutenant or the suppression of riots are usually conducted by one or more magistrates in command of an armed force. In the case of charges arising out of such affairs the magistrate may afterwards try them as a judge. He is thus enabled to act at once as judge and witness, and, of course, can prevent to a great extent any legal annoyance to the men under his control which might arise in the ordinary course of law. The stipendiaries exercise a good deal of their own judgment in deciding what meetings ought to be suppressed. The government usually respects their liberty of action in this matter. In a recent case, however, where a magistrate prohibited a public meeting on his own authority, the Lord-Lieutenant removed him to another district. The case occurred while Parliament was in session, and the Secretary for Ireland was much embarrassed in consequence of being unable to give any legal justification for the proceeding in that body. These circumstances were, however, quite out of the common course.

The working of the jury system in Ireland has some peculiar features of its own. That verdicts should be found in conformity with the wishes of the Executive is regarded, by both the government and the legal functionaries, as essential to the proper administration of justice. As this conviction is not shared by the population, considerable difficulty is often experienced by the judges in getting verdicts suitable to the wishes of the government. The complaint as to the existence of this difficulty is of old standing, in fact it dates from the introduction of English law among the Irish population. At the date of that introduction the latter were in possession of most of the land of the country, and for the due encouragement of law the Executive deemed it necessary to deprive them of the land in favor of English settlers. For this purpose the soil was first granted in full property to the Irish chieftains to the exclusion of the people. The chieftains were subsequently attainted by Acts of Parliament at different times, and their lands legally vested in the Crown. As the English law

had been established on the submission of the chieftains, in place of the original Celtic system of government, it became necessary to establish these confiscations in the courts, and there the jury system came into play. It was easy to have English judges, but in the greater part of the country Irish jurors had to be impanelled at least in part. To work the problem out by courts-martial or by juries brought over from England specially, was found to be entirely too costly, and so the use of Irish jurors had to be adopted. From the first, however, they manifested a remarkable difference of opinion from the judges and the English officials on the rights of the Crown to dispossess them of their ancestral lands. The poet Spenser, even in the reign of Elizabeth, speaks of this perversity of Irish jurors in almost the same terms as are used by the English press and officials at the present day. No matter how clearly the judges explained to them the justice of the Crown's claims in law, they could not be led to take the same view of the question as the Englishmen impanelled with them. Indeed, they frequently so puzzled the latter with quirks and subtleties that they hardly knew how to answer them, though themselves thoroughly convinced of the Crown's right to the Irish lands.

To meet this peculiar action of the Celtic jurors, which virtually rendered it impossible to deprive them of their lands except by purchase, several modifications of the jury system were successively attempted. Lord Strafford, in his attempt to break the titles of the possessors of the soil in Connaught, fined the jurors who refused to find for the Crown four thousand pounds a man, and committed the sheriff to jail for selecting such a jury. Nevertheless the attempt was only partially successful, as the juries refused to be intimidated, though they finally paid large sums to the Crown as a species of blackmail for leaving them alone. Another device was to give shares in the lands claimed by the Crown to the jurors who tried the case. The success of this, too, was only indifferent, and Strafford having, for other reasons, incurred the hostility of the English Parliament, they made his practices in Ireland available as charges to send him to the block. The Irish, and a portion of the English people, having risen simultaneously against the misgovernment of Charles the First, the latter first executed that monarch for tyranny and then confiscated the land of Ireland for rebellion. The due establishment of the law was given as the reason for both proceedings. The English law at a later period pronounced the proceedings wholly lawless, but confirmed their result in Ireland.

Though the burning question of ownership of the land was thus in some degree settled to the satisfaction of the law, Irish

jurors were still found singularly unwilling to acquiesce in the views of the government in other cases. In fact, the impression on the Celtic mind was that law as established among them and justice were not only distinct but naturally opposite to one another. Consequently, in the part of its administration which fell to them as jurors, they frequently considered they were bound in conscience to disobey the judges. In consequence, when the government of Charles the Second thought it expedient to execute the Primate of Ireland, in order to allay a panic in England, no Irish jury could be found to convict him, and he had to be brought to England before he could be legally found guilty and executed. As a final remedy for this spirit of disaffection among jurors, all Irish Catholics were made outlaws, and thus kept off juries. In this condition they were kept during the greater part of the last century; yet, on the relaxation of the Penal laws, it was found they still continued to look on law and justice as quite distinct in Ireland. The feeling still continues, in spite of the concentration of nearly all legal power in the hands of the official class, and thus to get verdicts suitable to the wishes of the government is a task of no small difficulty to the Irish administration.

The system usually employed in cases of importance is known as "packing" juries, though the term is not used by the officials. It must be remembered that there is a class in the Irish population which is in sympathy with the Crown, though a very small one. The officials and recipients of public patronage, in one shape or other, and a portion of the landowners constitute the bulk of this class. It is obvious, that if juries could be drawn exclusively from such persons, they would naturally find verdicts agreeable to the ideas of the Executive. As they are usually better off in point of wealth than the rest of the population, the qualifications for a place on the panel are fixed high in this respect. To be a juror in Ireland, in the higher courts, it is necessary that one must occupy premises rated at two hundred and fifty dollars a year. This excludes the great majority of the population at once, and gives the friends of the government much more weight in juries than in the country generally. In cases where the Crown prosecutor deems packing advisable, he orders all persons on the panel suspected of national feelings to stand by until further notice. This privilege is not possessed by the other side, who can only challenge twenty names. The Crown can also challenge, but in addition can order an unlimited number to stand by at discretion. Thus, if there are thirty-two reliable men in a panel of say two hundred, the Crown, after the prisoner's twenty challenges are out, can make the remaining twelve the representatives of the whole panel. This device

has been long practiced, and is still used at need by Crown prosecutors.

Simple as this system appears it is beset with practical difficulties, like most other legal administrative acts in Ireland. The majority of the class favored by law are Protestants, and thus packed juries have commonly an exclusively denominational character, which seems contrary to the religious equality provided for by the written law. Public opinion consequently indulges in comments very disagreeable to the feelings of both Crown prosecutors and judges, and which even have an effect on the packed jurymen. To prevent this the principle of contempt of court receives a wide application in the Irish tribunals. The judges claim as a right the power both of determining what constitutes contempt, and the punishment they may award for it. Press comments are the most common subject of punishment, and they are only punished when the journal in which they appear is of politics unfavorable to the Executive. Two instances last year, which happened in Dublin, will illustrate the practice of the judges. In each case a man was on trial for murder. In the first, an exclusively non-Catholic jury was packed, and while trying it they mixed freely with friends, and some of them got drunk and riotous in the hotel where they were detained during the night before rendering their verdict. For commenting on these facts the *Freeman's Journal* proprietor, who is a Home Rule member of Parliament, was sentenced to five hundred pounds fine and three months' imprisonment. The facts alleged were supported by the affidavits of fourteen persons, but the judge refused to hear any justification for attacks on jurymen in the discharge of their duty. Four months later a jury disagreed in another case, where the evidence was doubtful. The *Daily Express*, a journal devoted to the government, at once stated that the disagreement might be expected in consequence of the presence of a particular individual on the jury. The judge in this case ruled that though the comment was unwarrantable, he would take no action in the matter. It will scarcely cause surprise that "contempt of court" is not confined to the comments of the Press in Ireland.

We have now briefly described the peculiar features of the administration of the law at the present day in Ireland. That the popular feeling regards it with distrust and dislike is undoubted; it is simply impossible that it could be otherwise. In every other country of the civilized world the law is framed at least in intention to suit the requirements of the people to whom it is administered. In Ireland, for the last three centuries, it has been and still is framed in open disregard of their requirements, their feelings, and their rights as men. Instead of the law being for the people, the people have

been supposed to exist for the law. The mere prevention of crime or doing justice between the members of the community is treated by the government as an entirely secondary consideration to the maintenance of a system in accordance with English ideas, not with any principles of abstract right. At the present moment the army, which is supposed to uphold the law, furnishes a larger class of criminals than any other; and yet in the eyes of the judges and officials of Ireland, the military is a model body, whose respect for law is in striking contrast to the lawlessness of the people. It is not necessary to say more. The facts will tell whether the Irish people or their law-makers are deserving of the character of lawlessness so freely attributed of late to Ireland.

MR. MOZLEY'S REMINISCENCES OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

PERHAPS the importance of Mr. Mozley's *Reminiscences* will be more highly appreciated as time goes on. It has many facts. It is a contribution, and a most precious one, towards a complete biography of Newman. It is a partial and entertaining history of the great Oxford movement; it is suggestive and instructive on many points outside the circle of Oriel, Christ Church, and St. Mary's. It keeps alive the memory of not a few who would otherwise be forgotten, yet deserve on some accounts to be remembered. It is the writing of one of the most brilliant periodical writers of his time; and it is still more remarkable in this respect that, though the book is far more Roman than Anglican, the author remains a clergyman of the Church of England, and publishes at almost the very close of his career a defence of the peculiarities of the Catholic system as opposed to Protestantism, that is equally subtle, ingenious, and persuasive.

The interest which I feel as an individual in these fascinating volumes is increased by the fact of my having had some acquaintance with the author many years ago. In 1847 I was staying on a visit to Mr. Ward, the Vicar of Great Bedwyn, who was a friend of Mozley's, and, like him, an enthusiastic student of church architecture. Much is said about this very worthy man in chapter xcix. of the *Reminiscences*. Being in a deplorable state of health, and having occasion to see the Bishop of Salisbury on business, Mr.

Ward sent me all the way to Salisbury in his own carriage. But the journey was long, and he arranged that I should break it and rest the horses by stopping for an hour or so at Cholderton Rectory, Wilts, where Mr. and Mrs. Mozley (Newman's sister) received me with much kindness and hospitality. Four years later, when I happened to be in Bruges, I met Mr. and Mrs. Mozley again, breakfasted with them at the Hotel de Flandre, and accompanied them and their little daughter to the famous shrine of the relic of the Most Holy Blood. Little did I suppose, as I walked by the side of this unassuming clergyman of the Church of England, that he had thought as deeply as some even of our best men on the points at issue between the Churches, that his intellect and conscience approved the Roman solution of very difficult problems, and that I had myself but a child's knowledge of them in comparison with his. It must be granted, then, in the first place, that the *Reminiscences of the Oxford Movement* are a most valuable contribution towards a complete biography of Cardinal Newman. We have already been fortunate in such contributions from the hands of distinguished friends and acquaintances, but this comes to us from a man connected by marriage, who must have learned and observed more than the rest. History and biography have hitherto been miserably unsatisfactory, but we are gradually advancing towards a high appreciation of exact truth. Mozley came into residence at Oriel College in 1825, when he was nineteen years of age. In the following year he became one of Newman's pupils in the college, and, during two years and a half, saw very much more of his tutor than pupils usually saw even in those days when tuition meant something. When absent from Oxford he corresponded with Newman, and, at his encouragement and urgency, stood for a fellowship at Oriel, and was successful at Easter, 1829. From that time until Christmas, 1831, he resided, not only in term time, but also a good deal in the vacations, on intimate terms with Newman's mother and sisters; and with his circle of friends, whether at Oxford or in the country, he was in constant communication with Newman, till, in September, 1836, he became his brother-in-law, and accepted the living of Cholderton, in Salisbury Plain. Most of his clerical neighbors, he tells us, warmly sympathized with Newman, even if they did not all of them altogether agree with him. "It was a great thing to hear of anybody standing up for truth and for the Church." Knowing, as we do, how observant Mozley has been through life of the dealings of Providence with him in minute events,[1] we cannot feel surprised at his believing that his near relations with the chief of the Oxford movement were providential, and that his being permitted to write

[1] See Reminiscences, vol. ii., p. 425.

and publish these *Reminiscences* is so likewise; and I cannot trace in this connection the slightest symptom of unwarrantable egotism. The Oxford movement was at its height when Mozley began to write in the *British Critic*, which took the place of the *Tracts for the Times*. After being a contributor for two years he became its editor in place of Newman, and continued to be so till it ceased to exist, in October, 1843. The movement had come fairly into collision with the several parties it was meant to oppose. The "Evangelical" party denounced it as an emanation from the Evil one; the Churchmen of the old school were frightened by its excesses, and poured upon it torrents of bitterness through sermons, articles, pamphlets, episcopal charges, and suspension of Dr. Pusey. But the severest blow the movement had to sustain was being slowly prepared by the increasing tendency of the foremost combatants to throw down their arms, and range themselves on the side of Rome. Newman appears as the centre of a group of those who went over to Rome with him; and those who, having fought with him as Anglicans, remained behind. Of all of them together Mozley writes: "I may honestly say that, with the exception of Keble, I do not think one of them would be a living name a century hence but for his share in the light of Newman's genius and goodness. Yet even as the planets of such a system they are worthy of a better record than I am about to offer."

It was by the good providence of God that Newman did not follow law or music as a profession. He might have excelled in either, and have made himself a name. His parents intended him for the law, and we learn from Mr. Mozley that he actually kept some terms at Lincoln's Inn. The lessons of his pious mother influenced all his thoughts and ways. Her modified Calvinism took fast hold of his mind, and was riveted by the teaching of Dr. Watts, Baxter, Scott, Romaine, Newton, and Milner,—writers in whom, with all their Puritanical aberrations, was mingled a lively sense of the preciousness of the Great Sacrifice of the Cross, which is the soul and centre of Catholic ritual and dogma. "It would hardly be too much to say that he knew the Bible by heart;" and as time went on, and he came to instruct others, he had an "immense and almost minutely reverential knowledge of Scripture. . . . . In his later years he has described, in very touching language, the impossibility of shaking off or even modifying this sweetest of his early professions." It was a most superficial view of Scripture which led men to the conclusion that it was Protestant. Deeper study has convinced many, of whom Newman was the most remarkable, that it is the most Catholic book in the world. It was that book, more than all others, that brought him to the feet of the Vicar of Christ and successor of St. Peter.

Mozley's reminiscences of Newman's early years are interesting

beyond measure, and happily supplement the too scanty records to be found in the *Apologia*. He tells us, for example, that "John H. Newman used to be sensible of having lost something by not being a public school man. He regarded with admiration, and a generous kind of envy, the facile and elegant construing which a man of very ordinary talents could bring with him from the sixth form of any public school. 'You don't know how much you owe to Russell' (the head master of Charterhouse), he would say to me, though I was never one of those facile construers. In the biography referred to John H. Newman has not done justice to his early adventures and sallies into the domains of thought, politics, fancy, and taste. He very early mastered music as a science, and attained such a proficiency on the violin that, had he not become a Doctor of the Church, he would have been a Paganini. At the age of twelve he composed an opera. He wrote in albums, improvised masques and idyls; and only they who see no poetry in 'Lead, kindly light,' or in the 'Dream of Gerontius,' will deny that this divine gift entered into his birthright."

Though Newman had not the advantage of what is called a public school, he was sent at a very early age to Dr. Nicholas's at Ealing, said to be the best preparatory school in the country. There were three hundred boys there, and he rose, almost at a bound, to be at the head of the school. Thence he went straight to Trinity College, Oxford, and passed his examination for his degree at the earliest possible time, Michaelmas, 1820. He had then not quite completed his nineteenth year. His friends had expected that he would obtain high honors, but this expectation was not realized. The degree, of course, was obtained, and when the class lists came out his name was found under the line, which was as low as it could be. He cast no blame on the examiners, but always maintained that his reading had been too discursive. Perhaps this comparative failure only served to stimulate a laudable ambition, particularly as that was now associated with the desire of assisting his family in their declining fortunes.

There are some of Mr. Mozley's critics who think that his style is not sufficiently grave for the subjects which he treats; that he is by no means always accurate; that he frequently speaks of the leaders of the Oxford movement in a jaunty way, and that he reveals things now and then which are likely to prove displeasing to survivors or to some of the relations and friends of those who are no more. But when were volumes of Reminiscences ever written of which these things have not been said? And where are the Reminiscences of any account that would not be spoilt if they were much weeded and pruned? It is their merit to be free and easy, eschewing above all things that portraiture for a pur-

pose which makes biography in general so untrustworthy. Cardinal Newman himself has set an example of writing occasionally in a humorous strain on subjects of the deepest moment; witness "Loss and Gain," and many parts of his Lectures on the Present Condition of Catholics in England. Humor and sarcasm are great gifts, and a prophet of the Lord used them once on a memorable and solemn occasion.[1]

After some interesting particulars respecting the Newman family, who hovered in several spots in the neighborhood of Oxford during a number of years, the writer of the *Reminiscences* continues: "To no period of Newman's life do his younger friends turn with more curiosity than to his position in the Oriel common room for the first two or three years (after his being elected to a Fellowship in 1823). The truth is, it was very easy for a man to have no position at all there, especially just at that time. Newman, a shy man, with heart and mind in a continual ferment of emotion and speculation, yearning for sympathy and truth, was not likely to feel entirely at home with some, whom it would be needless to name or to describe. From the first he loved and admired the man with whom eventually he lived most in collision, Edward Hawkins. He would also have been ready to love and admire Whately to the end, but for the inexorable condition of friendship imposed by Whately—absolute and implicit agreement in thought, word, and deed. This agreement, from the first, Newman could not accord. His divergence was in fact radical. He used to say that Whately's *Logic* was a most interesting book, but that there was one thing not to be found in it, and that was logic. The truth is, every man in these days is his own logician. However, they lived for some time in close intimacy, and it is painful to remember that a time came when they were in the same city (Dublin) for seven years, passing one another in the streets, without even recognition." Cardinal Newman has left his own account of Dr. Whately and their intimacy at Oxford. He left it, he says, in 1831; "after that, as far as I can remember, I never saw him but twice—when he visited the University; once in the street, once in a room. From the time that he left, I have always felt a real affection for what I must call his memory; for thenceforward he made himself dead to me. My reason told me that it was impossible that we could have got on together longer; yet I loved him too much to bid him farewell without pain."[2] Separations like these are among the most painful events in life, and leave a smart behind them more acute than that caused by any other mode of bereavement.

Admiring Cardinal Newman, as we do, as a grand exponent of

[1] III Kings xviii. 27.

[2] Apologia (1864), p. 69.

the Catholic system of revealed truth, it is curious to look back on his debut nearly sixty years ago in the character of a parson. Mr. Mozley's account of it is particularly terse and suggestive. "In 1824 Newman took orders and became curate of St. Clements. This was then a quaint little church, in a very small churchyard, adjoining the toll-taker's shed at the east end of the picturesque bridge over the Cherwell, at the London approach to Oxford. At this time Newman was Secretary to the local branch of the Church Missionary Society, an occasional frequenter of the religious soirées held at the Vice-Principal's of St. Edmund's Hall, and on terms of more or less familiarity with a considerable number of men destined soon to part in many directions.. This church was soon filled, and, although his sermons, from the first, rather puzzled Mr. Hill and his weekly synod, they passed the censorhip and were pronounced, on the whole, spiritual. The parish of St. Clement's was increasing, and it devolved on Newman to undertake the building of a new church, on a more open site. This he had to leave very much to others, and the result was the singular edifice, compared by irreverent under-graduates to a boiled rabbit, on some low ground, on the bank of the Cherwell, opposite Magdalene Walks. There could hardly be imagined a building with less indications of the architectural reformation which has marked the last half century." Mr. Hill, the Vice-Principal of St. Edmund's Hall, of whom Mr. Mozley here speaks, was in his time a unique representative at Oxford of Church of England Calvinism, pure and simple. He prided himself on adhering faithfully to the Five Points, and omitted no opportunity in divinity or other lectures of introducing pious remarks of a strictly Calvinistic nature. His sympathies, of course, were with Huguenots and Puritans, with Jansenists and the Thirty-nine Articles. He was never tired of quoting "the pious Quesnel," whom he persisted in calling Quesnelle with a strong accent on the last syllable. His tea-parties, to which University men were the only guests invited, were commonly called "tea and prayers." After the tea had been handed round, he improved the occasion with remarks intended for edification, coupled with unctuous comments on Popish tendencies and Popish superstition. Then came the reading of a chapter in the Bible, an exposition, and long extempore prayer, Mrs. Hill, the Miss Hills and the servants being present. In lecture he had to build his doctrine of Final Perseverance on the overthrow of St. Paul, by which the eyes of some, if not many, of his pupils were opened to the errors of Calvin. But his life was pure; he was kind and well-intentioned, and on one occasion he even found himself sitting side by side with Dr. Pusey in a committee representing various re-

ligious parties united together for the impeachment of Dr. Hampden.

It is curious to look back on Cardinal Newman as associated at any time, however slightly, with such a divine. Evolution and the survival of the fittest seem to have brought him to something more than a variety of the same species. It is often said by Ritualists that if he had remained in the Church of England he might have wrought with it and have led it, at least in great part, by his genius into the Promised Land. But the answer to this is, that he was bound to follow the course of his own personal development, and to listen to the Voice others could not hear, and to obey the beckoning Finger which others could not see. To have continued in known schism in order to lead his brethren out of it would have been to forfeit for himself the grace he might have won for them. He would have gone down in the wreck, while they attained the shore. He might even have lost among them the influence he possessed, and, so far from conducting them like Moses, might have been numbered among the carcasses of them that were overthrown in the wilderness. His heroism consisted in this, that he forsook all for Christ, and he has, even in this life, been amply rewarded. His influence in the Church of England is, strange to say, still immense, and what it is in the Catholic Church there is no need to tell. The extreme beauty of "Lead, kindly light" lies in its expressing the principle of action to which his life was subjected from early years. "At what date he began to move in the direction which seems now plain enough it would not be easy to say. It never was possible to be even a quarter of an hour in his company without a man feeling himself to be invited to take an onward step sufficient to tax his energy or his faith; and Newman was sure to find out in due time whether that onward step had been taken. But though we may now construct a design, still we shall have to admit that it is only by being wise after the event, or with the event near in view."[1]

The early contemporaries of Newman at Oxford, of whom Mr. Mozley has left such pleasing remembrances, have most of them long ago departed this life. The attractive way in which he tells his anecdotes respecting them throws an interest over their names beyond any they could claim as men of distinction. An exception, however, must be made in the case of the Wilberforces, who derived from their illustrious father something more than a name. Had the great destroyer of the slave trade accepted the peerage which Pitt offered him, his sons might have been less known, and the name of his family less common in men's mouths than it is at present. They all owed much of their intellectual and moral

[1] Reminiscences, vol. i., chap. v.

character to him. But their mental development was favored by emancipation from the "Evangelical" party, in which their father was the brightest star. That party was singularly weak, especially at Oxford, in all branches of human knowledge. They could not show a single man there who combined scholarship, intellect and address in a considerable degree. "All watched with interest the course of the three already famous brothers. The result at this day is, that Robert (the archdeacon) and Henry are both numbered by the Evangelical world among Newman's victims, while Samuel (Bishop of Oxford and afterwards of Winchester) is partly admired, partly pitied, as a brand plucked from the burning, but with the smell of the burning strong upon him. No party in the Church claims him very decidedly, or would quote his authority upon any crucial question." They had, Mr. Mozley says, "a great love of natural history and of science, as far as they had been able to study it. Robert was much given to geology, and, upon joining the Church of Rome, and consequently renouncing his Anglican orders, he intended to devote himself to the study, but was not allowed (?) to do so by his new masters at Rome. Samuel was also fond of trees and flowers. I once heard him and a friend alternately name pines and taxodia till they had got over fifty. . . . Henry Wilberforce (afterwards for many years editor of the *Weekly Register and Catholic Standard*) had a great knowledge of insect life. His amusingly annotated copy of Pinnock's Entomological Catechism I cherished for many years. At classical schools of that period there was no such thing as natural history or science. From the age of ten or under till twenty-two it was Greek and Latin, Greek and Latin; parsing, criticism, antiquities, composition, history—all Greek and Latin. Latterly the history itself vanished into criticism. True, there were mathematics and a Mathematical Class List, yet I once had a discussion with a mathematical second class who did not know the difference between the planets and the fixed stars, and who could not believe it possible that the planets revolved round the sun." Catholics as well as Protestants have happily advanced beyond this puerile stage, but, seeing that Latin is the language of the Church, it is to be hoped the study of Mathematics and Physics will never be allowed to supersede that of Latin in the education of her youth. Among the innumerable benefits which the Catholic Church has conveyed to mankind is that of preserving in vital force the language and literature of ancient Rome.

Mr. Mozley's *Reminiscences* are not arranged in a systematic way, and it is hardly possible that they should have been so presented. Though Newman is the principal figure throughout, he often turns aside from following him in pursuit of less noble game.

Of Dr. Pusey he has little to say, and he dwells on few men of mark except the Wilberforces, Keble and Ward, Whately, Froude, Hampden and Arnold. Newman's influence at Oxford was eminently personal. He reminds us in this respect of the teachers of philosophy in ancient Athens, whose steps were followed by troops of disciples. A devoted body of pupils were attached to him in the year 1828, and many of these were wont to circle round the shopkeepers and housemaids at St. Mary's and listen to the dulcet tones of the preacher, who was so great and penetrating in his extreme simplicity. It was not till several years after this that he published any of his sermons, which he looked upon as little more than conversational addresses, not worthy of appearing in print. He walked or rode to his hamlet of Littlemore most days, and was almost always accompanied by some young friend, delighted to have such a privilege. Newman had not as yet formally separated himself from the "Evangelical" party, but after the completion of his "Arians" he felt strongly that he was parting company with his old friends, and wrote an elaborate comparison of the "Evangelical" school with the Church of England and the principal Anglican divines, and more particularly with the system of the Primitive Church. "It was put in the form of heads for inquiry. This he circulated in manuscript among his friends, including some who had been his pupils, and it was done so fairly, in so neutral a frame, that such Evangelicals as chanced to see it accepted the account of themselves and were thereby the better pleased to remain as they were." This was an extreme instance of that exact statement of the tenets of those from whom he differs, which has always characterized Cardinal Newman's writings. Unfairness is the one thing his adversaries will never be able to lay to his charge. "In the *Apologia*," Mr. Mozley says, "it does seem to me that Newman returns a long way towards his earliest religious impressions, and shows himself more at home with the Evangelical party. He relates the spiritual history of his soul, and records an impression, continually increasing till it becomes irresistible, that the Church of England is an external affair, out of the sphere of the soul, and incapable of being taken into it, but condemned to be always outside." There can be no doubt that the Catholic Church is intensely, and to some persons almost overpoweringly evangelical, in the true sense, and this may be the reason why Mr. Mozley fancies that he can discover in the *Apologia* a certain return on the writer's part to the religious impressions of his youth.

In the gallery of Oxford portraits which Mr. Mozley has given us, he has exhibited great skill combined with distinctness and accuracy. But not even his ability would have sufficed for the task, but for his long intimacy with those whom he has portrayed, and

the university which bound them together. Even the undecided character of his own career—much as we may regret it—he being at one time on the point of following his great brother-in-law to Rome, and then changing that determination and abiding where he was and still remains, has widened his experience of two classes of persons, those who did follow and those who did not, and given him an opportunity of watching closely the steps of those few, who have fallen away from Anglican and Catholic theology alike, and dropped down by degrees into the depths of indifference and unbelief. Of himself he speaks always with a manly humility, making an open and generous confession of his own weakness, incapacities and errors. He thus often disarms criticism and puts censure to shame. The weakest portion of his book is the reasons which he gives or rather does not give for conforming to the Catholic Church. Of the leading men in the Oxford movement he speaks with rare generosity of mind. "There can seldom," he says, "have occurred in the history of the world such an example of many men of high qualities and considerable promise, bringing their respective powers and opportunities to a religious cause, not clearly defined, and offering no earthly inducement whatever. . . . . When the trumpet of no uncertain sound, as it seemed, was now heard at Oxford, a direction was given and no more. All were to retrace their steps to an age of which they knew nothing, except that it was in every respect the very contrary of that we live in. As far as any hope of comfort, luxury, or splendor was concerned, it was a march to the North Pole, the Equator, or nowhere at all. That a dozen men with golden futures should abandon them for such an enterprise would be something; but hundreds did so, and if I name a few, many of my readers could easily and immediately double or quadruple the list. . . . . Isaac Williams was a very considerable poet, and for his share in the movement was beaten in the contest for the Professorship of Poetry, by a man who could not write a line of poetry."[1]

Let us go back for awhile to some of the miscellaneous recollections of Newman. "He might be supposed," his brother-in-law tells us, "to have really believed the English translators inspired, for any critical comment he ever made on the Authorized Version, as if he would rather have every defect in it implicitly swallowed than that it should be made the sport of scholarship, such as scholarship was in those days. . . . . Even village preachers, after reading some disquisition on a corrected text, would air their newly-acquired scholarship to the poor rustics before them." The fact is Newman had too much sense to meddle with the Authorized Version in his parochial sermons as many

[1] Reminiscences, ii., 1, 3.

parsons do. He knew well that it has many defects of translation, but he knew also that congregations are utterly incapable of judging of the merit of any emendation, and that the rectifications of most of the preachers were of a pitiably shallow description. We feel interested in learning that up to the end of 1829, Newman, besides being a tutor, was a parish priest and preacher, a great reader, and on rare occasions a writer also. The relation of tutor led, as Mr. Mozley thinks, the way. To this he devoted himself in a special manner. His charity began at home in the room where he had quiet talk with his younger friends. The interest he felt in his pupils was contagious, for young men are sure to find out quickly who really cares for them and has interests in common with them. He was not one of the many college tutors whose relations to the undergraduates were simply official and nominal. He stood in the place of a father to them, or of an elder and affectionate brother. His pupils are generally agreed that the best work he did with them was in private, in conversation, in revising essays or biographies which he had set them. He asked for much more than the faculty of disputation. His first care was that the pupil should know what he intended to say, and what his words really meant. He was a severe critic of poetry, and pressed hard for an explanation of vague expressions. "He entered early into university office. He was examiner in the Classical School in 1827 and 1828; he was Pro-proctor for a year. There was before him, in all human likelihood, a high university career, with its usual consequences in the larger field of the Church."[1]

Mr. Mozley is a Boswell in the style of his *Reminiscences*. Indeed, there are many to whom his book will be the most engaging they have read since they made acquaintance with Boswell's Johnson. He can indulge in mere gossip, but gossip is fascinating when it relates to one whom the world in general agrees to admire. "In his earliest Oriel days," he tells us, "Newman rode a good deal. The use, and still more the possession of a horse, was then one of the principal charms of a Fellowship. . . . . Newman rode well enough to come to no mishaps. Besides taking his chance of the Oxford hacks, he had for some time a rather dangerous animal, Klepper, a pretty creature with Arab blood, which had been brought over from Ireland by Lord Abercorn, then at Christ-Church. It was said that she had been bred in small square inclosures, where she had to get her living by picking up what she could on the rough edges of the ground. In such a place, when she chose to take a run, she had to turn at a sharp angle every two hundred yards. The tendency remained, and involved some strain on the rider's attention, and nerve also. Newman had always a difficulty

[1] Reminiscences, i., 180–182.

in keeping her straight and saving himself from his own momentum. Klepper became mine, and I lent her one day to C. P. Eden, duly warning him of the creature's dangerous tendency. On his first and last attempt to ride her, he found himself lying, sadly contused, on the turf of Bullington Green, and Klepper nowhere in sight."

Henry Wilberforce, it seems, from the first used to speak of Newman as ὁ Μέγας, but he knew the inner man. His appearance was not commanding. He did not carry his head aloft, nor did he make the best use of his height. He had a slight bend forwards, owing perhaps to his rapid movements and to his always talking in his walks. There was no pride in his port, no defiance in his eye. His gait was that of one bent on serious business. It was impossible to see him without feeling interested, yet some were disappointed by his presence. How little like the great Oxford don or pillar of the church! He might pass, they said, for a Wesleyan minister, with his long-tailed coat, morning same as evening, and not always over new. There were those who clung to him and formed a party, adopting his ways. They despised solemnity of manner and stateliness of gait, for he whom they regarded as their master walked quickly, and with a congenial companion would talk uninterruptedly. "George Ryder said of him that when his mouth was shut it looked as if it never could open; and when it was open looked as if it never could shut. Yet he was never so busy or so preoccupied but that he had always upon him a burden of conscientious duties to be attended to, calls of civility or kindness, promises to be fulfilled, bits of thoughtfulness carried out, rules of his own to be attended to." He never allowed the matters of high pith and moment which were his ordinary pursuit to interfere with the drudgery of life. He used to astonish the High Street tradesmen with the rapidity and the infallible accuracy with which he went through the parish accounts, and it was a characteristic that he never complained of any unexpected addition to his work, or any interruption. When a clerical friend had promised a sermon on a saint's day and proved a defaulter an hour before the time, he would throw aside work he was busily and eagerly engaged in, and write a sermon himself with every sign of careful preparation. He always claimed to have been substantially the same from first to last, except in progress and development. What a happy conviction, especially in one who was ever looking out for heaven-sent guidances, impulses and assistance! He believed that each one had a particular part and special work to be accomplished, and whatever happened, he interpreted it as providentially designed. His walking companions often noticed a striking peculiarity in his character. This was his admiration of the beauties of earth and sky, his quickness to observe the changes overhead

and the meaning he put into them. He was as fond of flowers as a child could be. He seldom saw a flower without its reviving some memory. His eye caught, as he walked briskly forward, "any sudden glory or radiance above; every prismatic hue or silver lining; every rift, every patch of blue; every strange conformation, every threat of ill, or promise of a brighter hour. He carried his scenery with him, and on that account had not the craving for change of residence, for mountains and lakes, that most educated people have. Unless his voyage with Froude to the Mediterranean in 1832, be excepted, he never made a tour for pleasure's sake, for health's sake, or for change sake. He did move about a good deal, but it was to the country parsonages to which so many of his friends were early relegated. These visits sometimes took him into districts singularly wanting in the features constituting 'scenery' and 'landscapes.' But even in Salisbury Plain, where there are no trees, no hedges, no water, no flowers, no banks, no lanes, and now not even turf, and seldom even a village or church in sight, he would run or walk with a friend as cheerfully as the prophet ran before the king from Carmel to announce the opened gates of heaven to Jezreel."

Mr. Mozley would never have entered so fully into particulars respecting his brother-in-law, never have dwelt so lovingly as he has dwelt on his ways and works, if he had not felt a lively spiritual interest in the faith toward which his leader was steadily advancing. Indeed, when, in 1843, he returned from Normandy, having formed a closer acquaintance with the Catholic religion, he wrote to Newman, and to various members of his family, saying that he had serious thoughts of joining the Church of Rome. He wrote at the same time to Rivington, giving up the editorship of the *British Critic*. Newman was surprised, and did not think his brother-in-law was in a state to take so serious a step. This was plain from his own showing, and he therefore distinctly advised him to "think over it two years." "Had Newman," he says, "expressed approval, or the merest acquiescence, I should have gone over at once, with what consequences I can hardly venture to imagine." Two years later he who gave the advice had himself esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasure of the Egyptians, but he had a keen perception of character, and has probably never regretted having advised his brother-in-law to wait and prove all things before taking a step of such tremendous import. Mr. Mozley after the lapse of thirty-nine years reviews his position at that critical moment. He believes he was seeking rest. "I was distracted," he says, "and wearied with discussions above my measure, my faculties, and my attainments. . . . . I really think it would have suited my nature to accept all the decisions of the Church of

Rome in a quiet lay fashion, and then turn my attention to matters more in my own line. Yet even if thus I had escaped shipwreck, I might have rotted in harbor and gone down."

It was soon very evident that Mr. Mozley, though taking the two years, was not employing them as directed. He was not waiting for the fuller light and clearer voice of his Heavenly Guide. He did not find himself at home in a state of expectancy, in which he was not to trust to the ordinary reason that had hitherto been his director, but to wait for an enlightened volition. The strong impetus towards Rome passed by. The fear of compromising his liberty appears to have been too great for him. He pleads for himself a sort of right to make open questions of vital points. He shelters himself under the liberty allowed, as he maintains, to Jewish believers. "I too," he exclaims, "am a citizen of no mean city. I too claim the right to exercise my private judgment wherever nature speaks and scripture leaves me free." These words imply a resolution which our readers will deplore. But in spite of that resolution, in virtue of which Mr. Mozley still ministers in the Church of England, he has gone out of his way to defend with much force and ingenuity the foremost doctrines of the Roman system, and it is quite worth while to follow him in the line he takes. At the very time that he is defending Rome, he brings unanswerable charges against the Anglican sect. "What," he asks, "is to be said of a church whose professed members have, for the most part, no other visible observance but to put on their best clothes and sit for an hour and a half once a week hearing oratorical prayers, choir music and a well-written discourse?" But Mr. Mozley does far more. He returns to what he calls "the great rock of offence," the worship of the Blessed Virgin, and he asks, "What is the teaching of nature?" The answer is familiar to all who are in the habit of reading our devotional works, but it is anything but familiar to those for whom especially Mr. Mozley's *Reminiscences* were published. He asks, what became of the household of Nazareth, when death released it finally from its earthly ties? Jesus had lived there for thirty years in complete obedience and the most loving interchange of kindnesses and even benefits. "It was a real and true companionship. It was an actual family. Jesus was no shadow. He was not a piece of Divine mechanism. He was not deceiving Mary and Joseph with a show of goodness. He was not acting the part of a son. We cannot doubt that He loved Mary to the fulness of His nature, which was Divine. It would be a very idle refinement to say that He loved her as man only, for in Him the human and divine nature were united. That nature, human and divine, He bore with Him to heaven. But what is human nature without its objects and belongings?" The Reminiscent then proceeds to show that the

love of Mary and of Joseph could not be bound by conditions of space or time. Some persons may think it a terrible presumption to place Mary and Joseph the carpenter near the throne of the universe. But it would surely be a far more terrible presumption to place them anywhere else. "Can we possibly suppose them to be laid deep in the dull catacombs of an intermediate state, waiting the solemnity of the trumpet call? Can we suppose them somewhere, walking sadly and pensively in laurel groves? Can we suppose them enjoying that mere rest which is of all things the most wearisome? Can we imagine them relegated for ages to some corner of the universe, out of sight and out of mind? Would the Son intermit His love, and stop the flow of His affection for thousands of years, till the time arrived for the reappearance of Joseph and Mary in the innumerable crowd to be then gathered, and separated right and left? In a word, is there any one positive conception of the present state of Joseph and Mary so natural and so reasonable as that they are now with Christ, and where He is, at the right of the Father?" But these questions, subtle and far-reaching as they are, do not meet the principal objections which long centuries of demur and reproach have caused to have so much weight with Anglicans. They are that it is taken for granted that Mary, though finite, hears our prayers, and that Christ, being all-sufficient, and the "one mediator between God and man," no mediatrix is wanted or been admissible. These objections are urged all around us as if they were conclusive and no answer could be given to them. But they are far from appearing in this light to Mr. Mozley. He replies very properly that "with the mechanical agencies wielded by modern civilization (alluding to the marvels of telegraphy) there is nothing inconceivable, or even difficult, in the idea of the whole human race being put in loving accord and intellectual relation with one person. Surely the great Artificer of the universe, wielding forces far surpassing our knowledge, could delegate to whomsoever He will what He pleases of His sovereignty. It would only correspond to the greater part of the work done here below. Vicarious agency is the rule of human life. . . . . The most confident and independent have to admit, as regards themselves, that they are occupying a mediatorial position, and that they are the ordained receivers and dispensers of mercy, truth and grace. But whatever is done on earth can undoubtedly be done more easily as well as better in heaven. If Christ tolerates such poor rulers and such poor teachers as we find below, why may He not have good servants above, doing His work better? . . . . Englishmen have not been born and bred to believe in the Syrian household, the inmates of the carpenter's shop, assisted by cousins, brothers or neighbors doing this mighty work (of governing the world);

the gentle Mother now as prominent a figure, as specially loved and as immediately obeyed by all the powers of earth and heaven, as when the Babe sat on her lap, or the Son helped in the household offices. Where are we to stop, if indeed it is wished we should stop anywhere, when we read the title, 'The Mother of God,' won by generations of controversy, and still resolutely claimed for Mary of Nazareth?"

Of all subjects of meditation which penetrate the cloister of the celibate, the study of the theologian, and generally the secret chambers of the devout, there is none more frequent and more highly prized than the relations—marvellous, mysterious and infinitely tender relations—between the child Jesus and His Virgin Mother. These meditations seem to have taken a wonderful possession of Mr. Mozley's mind, and we find them bearing remarkable fruit in the pages from which a few extracts have been given. He has sat in imagination in that humble but holy house of Nazareth, and watched Mary nursing, feeding and teaching her Babe to pray and sing, introducing Him to His own inheritance, His own kingdom, His own subjects, to the flowers and creatures, the budding trees, the changing skies, the temple and the shores. Her house was the early school of Him who was to be the Teacher of mankind. If it is our privilege as Christians to be in Him and He in us, is not she also in Him and He in her after a way immeasurably transcending our way, and in a sense appertaining only to her? If the remarkably shrewd Anglican rector writes thus of Mary and Joseph and the home of Nazareth, we can feel no surprise at finding him defend Rome in her views of the most holy Sacrament, the Trinity, and the Saints. England is the only country where the battles of Rome are fought and many of her victories achieved by those who are external to her pale. Cardinal Wiseman stood amazed at this phenomenon, even in his time, and expressed very plainly his astonishment at the sight. An entire party therein is now openly defending the doctrine of the Mass, and the first principles laid down by Mr. Mozley respecting the delegated mediation of Mary will no doubt ere long be commonly taught by disciples of his, even as he has learnt them in an elementary form from the teaching of Keble. Catholicism, fiercely opposed and driven back at this point and the other, is nevertheless winning new triumphs as a philosophy and science. It is rendering the belief in God more strong, the belief in Christ more indispensable, the belief in the Holy Ghost more reasonable and experimental. The weapons of its warfare are less than ever carnal: they have become more purely intellectual.

To return to the Oxford movement. The leading men were projecting the *Tracts for the Times*, for tracts were the order of the

day, and, the land being overrun with "evangelical" tracts, it seemed well that old truths rediscovered should be diffused by similar means. But Newman was the only one among the chief movers in the affair who could write a tract effectively. Other contributors wrote essays or sermons or extracts from their commonplace books, but not tracts. Their attempts compared with Newman's were padding and make-weights, and, though wise and learned, were not likely to take hearts by storm. Some among the writers had never another occasion of sharing a glory and a greatness not their own. But Newman, with all his supereminent ability, was indulgent and at times overindulgent to very inferior men. "Like Walter Scott, he could only see the best and highest parts of the human character, hoping ever against hope. He expected rivers out of the dry ground, and found poetic beauty in the quaintest and most rugged writers. Wise and experienced Oxford observers smiled at the confidence he reposed in men who were at best broken reeds and bulrushes, if not stocks and stones. He could appreciate writers whom nobody else could, seeing sense in their obscurity and life in their dulness." Yet he could not but be sensible that the clear notes of his own voice were deadened in the various voices of the *Tracts*, and he published in 1834 a volume of the *Parochial Sermons*, which are so peculiarly his individual utterances. Great was their success; they were copied and preached from many pulpits, and are sold and read to this day with the author's sanction and edited by one of his constant friends. They are marked by great simplicity, sincerity, tenderness and power. They wrought much for the movement in a new direction, and put a new weapon in the movers' hands. These again were supplemented by the *Lyra Apostolica*, which appeared first in the *British Magazine*. Although these poems are the joint production of six writers, among them, as among the authors of the *Tracts for the Times*, Newman is by far the chief. Nor does this apply to the merit of the compositions only, but also to their number. Even those written by Keble are more than doubled by the poems signed γ., which was Newman's signature. If they aided the movement, it was because there are minds to which the same ideas appeal more readily in verse than in prose. Many of the thoughts with which they were rife were deep, mysterious, religious, and therefore specially suited to poetry. Many were founded on Scripture, or alluded to Scripture, and Scripture is, and, as we hope, ever will be, dear to the English mind. There is one among them—"Lead, kindly Light"—which has found its way into every church and chapel in England, and is quoted by Dissenting ministers in their sermons and addresses at the graveside. It was recently sung at the Cathedral of Christ Church,

Oxford, on the occasion of the funeral of Dr. Pusey, where Cardinal Newman was represented among the mourners by Father Hutton of the Oratory.

Several anecdotes related of Newman in his Oxford days are worth preserving, and the affection of his friends gathers up every memorial of his life when vicar of St. Mary's. One little matter of self-imposed duty, arising out of a painful occasion, will be remembered, Mr. Mozley says, by all who ever accompanied him in a country walk. One morning Dornford asked him whether he was going to Littlemore that day, and whether on foot or horseback. He had to reply that he was riding there, when Dornford proposed to accompany him. This gentleman, having served two years in the Rifle Brigade in the Peninsular War, and, being proud of his military character, was in the habit of cantering on the hard road, and had generally to do it alone. But Newman was in for it. In those days the first mile-stone between Oxford and Iffley was in a narrow, winding part of the road, between high banks, where nothing could be seen fifty yards ahead. Dornford and Newman heard the sound of a cart, and the latter detected its accelerated pace, but the impetuous "captain," as he loved to be styled, heeded it not. It was the business of a cart to keep its own side. They arrived within sight of the cart just in time to see the carter jump down, and be caught instantly between the wheel and the mile-stone, falling dead on the spot. The shock on Dornford was such that he was seriously ill for two months, and hypochondriac for a much longer time. The result in Newman's case was a solemn vow that, whenever he met a carter driving without reins, or sitting on the shaft, he would make him get down; and this he never failed to do. There were probably many other things which Newman bound himself to do, and some of them much less easy to accomplish. His was a life made up of resolutions, and he cut beforehand many a channel in which it was to flow. He never passed a day at Oxford without writing a sentence in Latin, either original or a translation, before he had done his morning's work. He often asked his friend to wait a minute or two before starting for their walk while he wrote this daily scrap. Another habit was to lay by a history of every serious question in which he was concerned, a summary of each book he read, or his opinion concerning it, and an account of every subject he inquired into. His mind, therefore, was always analyzing and going over analyses. When he set others, however, subjects for essays, they were not abstract, but biographies, accounts of periods, crises, political constitutions and changes. Public opinion has latterly decided that such subjects, in which the facts of history figure largely, are to be preferred to mere moral essays.

Dr. Pusey does not figure largely in Mr. Mozley's *Reminiscences*. His career, perhaps, is too well known, and he is not now the object of attention he once was. In his latter years he has been dropping down from the public eminence he once occupied, for the simple reason that his work is in a great measure done. His ambition was to restore the preponderance of what are called "Church Principles," the belief in the efficacy of the Sacrament, absolution, sacrifice, and confession. An amazing change has been wrought in the Church of England in these respects, and with these, we suppose, Dr. Pusey was more or less satisfied. He was essentially Protestant from first to last; and the wide divergence of the two illustrious friends without breach of friendship is the most remarkable instance of mutual self-restraint which ecclesiastical history can show. Never have Newman and Pusey written or spoken one unkind word of each other! Newman and Keble also met before one of them passed away from earth, not in reconciliation, for they never quarrelled, but in love and friendship. And this mutual faithfulness unto death of the great leaders is certain to augment in a great degree their combined and their several influence on posterity. Mr. Mozley, speaking of them together, says: "Pusey, Keble, and Newman had each an individuality capable of a development, and a part, beyond that of any former scholar, poet, or theologian in the Church of England. Each lost quite as much as he gained by the joint action of the three." Had they continued united till death, the case would have been different, but, as matters now stand—Newman alone among them having submitted to the Apostolic See—there must ever continue to be a mutual limitation of each other's influence, so far as he and his two friends are regarded. They will be still holding out for the bewildered Church of England; he will be pleading for the unchangeable Church of Rome.

Among those who at one time were numbered as agents in the Oxford movement was a writer who has since obtained celebrity as an essayist and historian, moving on totally different lines. This is James Anthony Froude. Elected Fellow of Exeter College in 1842, he disturbed the minds of serious friends by the boldness of his speculations, and by the pleasure he seemed to feel in distinctive paradoxes. After a time a reaction in his mind was reported; and Newman, who was engaged in bringing out the Littlemore *Lives of the Saints*, invited his assistance. Many hands were employed in the work. "One writer alone," to use the words of Mr. Kegan Paul,[1] "avowedly drew on his imagination. His conduct in so doing has always been regarded, by those who know the circumstances, as an act of singular unfaithfulness to the dear

[1] Century, New York, June, 1882.

friend of his dead brother. The *Life of St. Bettelin* was intrusted to Mr. James Anthony Froude, and the following is the peroration of this very graceful work of fiction: "And this is all that is known, and more than all, yet nothing to what the angels know of the life of a servant of God who sinned and repented, and did penance and washed out his sins, and became a saint, and reigns with Christ in heaven." Mr. Froude has not alluded to it in his recent account of the Tractarian movement at Oxford; but the matter is not without interest, and may, perhaps, throw some light on his whole method of writing history and biography.

The result of this singular occurrence was a sudden snap of the slight and precarious tie of friendship which existed between Newman and the Froude of Exeter. There had never, Mr. Mozley says, been any real joining, and where the old crack had been there was now a complete fracture. They departed upon lines increasingly divergent, and there appears little prospect of their ever meeting again.

There was another agent in the Oxford movement, mentioned by the *Reminiscences*, whose lot it was to figure conspicuously in the eye of the public. He represented, according to this authority, intellectual force, irrefragable logic, absolute self-confidence, and headlong impetuosity. "Whatever he said or did was right." I should be disposed to qualify some of these assertions, and, so far as I have had any means of observing, I consider them decidedly overstatements. "He had," Mr. Mozley says, "been instantaneously converted to Newman by a single line in an introduction to one of his works, to the effect that Protestantism could never have corrupted into Popery,"—a weighty and suggestive remark, but hardly likely to effect of itself so sudden a change in a man of Mr. Ward's grasp of mind. I well remember the time when his *Ideal of a Christian Church* made its appearance, and the excitement it caused among many of the young clergy, who read it and passed it on from one to another in country parishes. Dr. Pusey distinctly recommended it, and would even send it down to a young curate who could not afford to buy the bulky volume. This appeared to me singular, nor could I comprehend this recommendation on the Doctor's part, seeing that the book was evidently intended to lead on and up to assent to the entire Roman system. But he recommended, also, that the Littlemore *Lives of the Saints*, with their showy covers, and books by Roman Catholic authors, such as *The Life of St. Peter of Alcantara*, which he kindly put into my hand. Indeed, when we recited the canonical hours in his house, and made use each of a breviary, the invocations of St. Mary in the prayers were omitted, and a slight pencil-mark was drawn across them. I fancied at the time that they were put before our eyes in

this manner in order to familiarize us with them by degrees; but the subsequent career of Dr. Pusey, his strenuous efforts to retain those in Anglicanism who announced to him their intention of "going over to Rome," and his adherence to the last in the communion of the Anglican Church, make it doubtful to me now whether that was really his design. We are now assured that he refused to the last to believe that it was intended by Newman to quit the Church of England, though he had learned it from himself and by numberless other indications. But at the particular time to which I am referring those who were foremost in the movement concurred not only in Roman doctrine on the basis of Tract xc., but in a variety of observances also unknown to Anglicanism and proper to the Catholic Church. This was the state of things during the condemnation of various propositions extracted from the *Ideal of a Christian Church*, which took place in the theatre at Oxford on February 13th, 1845, and made Mr. Ward the hero of the day. His subsequent conduct was not wanting in dignity; and his marriage, though the subject of much laughter and jeering, was in no degree inconsistent with his previous conduct or writings. In the Catholic Church he found a thoroughly congenial sphere, and "took to" it with almost passionate delight. During seven years he, though a layman, professed dogmatic theology at Old Hall, and received from Pope Pius IX. the honorary degree of Ph.D. He was highly popular among the students of divinity, and his lectures were published after their delivery. Cavillers were sometimes found against this or that point; but his spirit of submission to the authority of the Holy See was so profound that he quieted all objections with the utmost ease. When he became editor of the *Dublin Review*, in 1863, it was with the intention of combating very distinctly the minimizing views, as they were called, of the *Home and Foreign Review*. He maintained uniformly the need of submission, not only to doctrines pronounced to be of faith by the infallible authority of the Church, but to the decisions of the Pontifical Congregations in the sense and after the manner laid down by his Holiness, Pius IX., in a brief addressed to the Archbishop of Munich, in December, 1863. In consequence of this document the *Home and Foreign Review* was discontinued, and Mr. Ward continued for many years to publish in the *Dublin Review* some masterly essays on philosophy and religion. Afterwards brought out in separate volumes. His defence of intuitional philosophy has been much admired by competent judges, and it is said to have drawn from John Stuart Mill the confession that, though he had been attacked by writers of greater repute, he had never been hit so hard as by Mr. Ward. This zealous convert joined with Tennyson, Cardinal Manning, and others in founding the Metaphysical So-

ciety, and a member of it belonging to an opposite school of thought has said of him, "No man in the Society was more universally liked. The clearness, force, and candor of his argument made his papers welcome to all,—for in that Society nebulousness was almost the rule, weakness chronic, and inability to understand an opponent's position, rather than want of candor, exceedingly common. The present writer well remembers the dismay Mr. Ward caused amongst the Experience School of philosophy by a paper on 'Memory,' in which he maintained that unless you had at least one intuitive faculty, unless you had an absolutely intuitive certainty that the absolute asseverations of memory were indisputably true asseverations, not only the experimental philosophy, but all philosophy, all coherent thought, became impossible at once. 'You are hearing at this moment,' he said, 'the *last* word of the sentence, but how do you know the other words of which it is composed? Simply by *remembering* them.' 'Unless you assume that memory is to be trusted, you cannot understand the meaning of a single sentence which is uttered; nay, you cannot so much as apprehend its external bodily sound.' That fell like a bombshell among the antagonists of intuitive certainty. And yet no one took more pains to understand the school of Mr. John Stuart Mill, or received more full recognition from that school, as meeting their philosophy fairly, and face to face, than Mr. Ward. From the time, indeed, that he ceased to become a regular attendant at the Metaphysical Society, the Metaphysical Society began to lose its interest, and to drop into decay. Such was the attractive power of at least one strong and definite philosophical creed."

Mr. Mozley says but little of the great and good, though far from clear-headed man, who gave his name to a school of thought—one might almost say to a new schism—and has lately passed away from earth. He was present, however, as the writer of this article was likewise, when Dr. Pusey delivered his memorable sermons on "Sin after Baptism." Every corner of the vast and chill cathedral of Christ Church was filled. Still silence prevailed; every word told; but they were words of fear. "Impossible . . . . . to renew them again unto repentance!" Their loss irreparable, and the sin after baptism not to be washed away! Well may Mr. Mozley have to tell us that, "Not a soul could have left that church without deep and painful feelings." But, though stunned for a time, they afterwards came to take a less desponding view of the case of post-baptismal sin, and to see also how different it was in a general way from the case contemplated by the Apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The theology of Pusey, Keble, and the other leaders of the movement was undoubtedly overcast by a certain gloom, whether they expressed themselves in prose or verse. I remember

a lady of the Evangelical school remarking to me at the time how frequently the word "dread" occurred in Keble's *Lyra Innocentium* and the *Lyra Apostolicæ*, which appeared in the *British Magazine*, was darkly shaded here and there. But this was hardly to be regretted. The searchers after truth who wrote thus were professedly penitents, and pilgrims should not always be singing hymns of gladness. Mr. Ward, like so many other leaders of the Oxford movement, has departed from among us since these *Reminiscences* were first projected. He has entered, doubtless, into that rest which is constantly associated with the idea of music, in which he delighted more than most men; and he is now able to harmonize many, if not all, the things which to the fineness of his intellectual ear appeared discordant. But of this surely he is convinced more strongly than ever that the very notion of a living and ruling God involves that of a Church ruling with authority in His name. We shall ever regard the Oxford movement with grateful interest as having tended powerfully in this country to break in pieces the most irrational of all ideas that have long held sway over the human mind, namely, that the Supreme Being, having at last sent into the world His Son, the Messiah, of whom the prophets had spoken age after age, and having recalled that Son when His work of redemption was accomplished, left the record of these events to be recorded in a book, but gave no man or men authority to interpret it.

BOOK NOTICES.

A History of the People of the United States, from the Revolution to the Civil War. By *John Bache McMaster*. Vol. i. (1784–1790), 8 vols. 622 pp. D. Appleton & Co., New York. 1883.

A period which, in the hands of most writers who have treated the history of the United States, is singularly jejune and uninteresting to the general reader, becomes in the hands of Mr. McMaster remarkably attractive from the graphic manner in which he brings into relief the people in their general life and in the discussion of all questions that occupied men's minds.

A country, even with its original limits of vast extent, and with the modes of intercourse then known of almost immeasurable distances, recognized by the great powers of the civilized world as an independent republic, with an intelligent, active, energetic population, it nevertheless presented the strange spectacle of being ruled by a fugitive government, a Congress with a quorum of often only a dozen members, flitting from Philadelphia to Princeton, from Annapolis to Trenton, from Trenton to New York.

While the General Government had little power, and obtained little respect, except in its intercourse with foreign nations, the State governments maintained order, protected trade and industry, and developed the resources of the country. They too had their difficulties, and the rebellion of Shays in the well-ordered commonwealth of Massachusetts, the establishment of the insurrectionary State of Franklin, and the feeling in Vermont which looked upon British rule preferable to submission to New Hampshire or New York, showed that even the State systems could not stand too severe a strain.

People went on in a kind of happy reliance on Providence that some stable form of government would in time be evolved, just how or when nobody knew, though some, half in jest yet with a touch of real earnest, proposed a monarchy, with Frederic, Duke of York, boy bishop of Osnaburg, the future scandal of the British army, as sovereign.

In a happy spirit of security the new nation worked its way, pushing settlements in the interior, opening trade with China, negotiating with the Barbary States, trying the markets of the West Indies; the first attempts that had any look of success in the application of steam to navigation were made in this period; a country without a mint and without coin discussed with no little thoroughness the whole question of paper-money; in the field of religion all bodies, except the Congregationalists, who recognized no custodians of Divine power but the church members in each meeting-house, all were looking to Europe for some new organization in America. Science, art, literature had few votaries; but Webster was already proposing his reforms in English orthography, and had begun the vast influence acquired by his Speller and Dictionary.

It is strangely enough the period when George Washington had no influence, except that exercised as a private gentleman in the neighborhood of his Virginia plantation.

The scope of the author's work is best given in his own words: "The history of the people shall be the chief theme. At every stage of the splendid progress which separates the America of Washington and Adams from the America in which we live, it shall be my purpose to describe

the dress, the occupations, the amusements, the literary canons of the times; to note the changes of manners and morals; to trace the growth of that humane spirit which abolished punishment for debt, which reformed the discipline of prisons and jails, and which has, in our own time, destroyed slavery and lessened the miseries of dumb brutes. Nor shall it be less my aim to recount the manifold improvements, which, in a thousand ways, have multiplied the conveniences of life and ministered to the happiness of our race, to describe the use and progress of that long series of mechanical inventions and discoveries which is now the admiration of the world, and our just pride and boast; to tell how, under the benign influence of liberty and peace, there sprang up in the course of a single century a prosperity unrivalled in the annals of human affairs; how, from a state of great poverty and feebleness, our country grew rapidly to one of opulence and power; how her agriculture and manufactures flourished together; how, by a wise system of free education and a free press, knowledge was disseminated, and the arts and sciences advanced; how the ingenuity of the people became fruitful of wonders far more astonishing than any of which the alchemists had ever dreamed."

The material for such a social history as is here proposed are scattered and in many points defective. The early American newspapers are very jejune, and the news columns tell us less than the advertisements of the way in which people lived, their houses, their markets, the material for clothing, the amusements and books of the day. New England is rich in local histories, which give many pictures of every-day life, and the absorbing local questions of past generations, but the personal memoirs and correspondence, the chatty diaries and journals, where friends and enemies are sketched in bold masterly strokes, are very few in number. The pamphlets of the time are chiefly political and religious, dealing more in logic than in facts. We have histories of some of our great trades and manufactures, of the theatre in America, of some religious denominations and their early efforts for education, some contributions to the history of internal intercourse by canal, steamboat, and railroad; but very little as to history of agriculture, home life, the kitchen, the market, weddings, and funerals.

Striking out a new path the author has been in the whole wonderfully successful. Similar works may appear, and doubtless will, but few will show as much skill in weaving in the series of pictures into the historical tapestry that he hangs up for us.

The picture of the population scattered over the country, less than two millions and a half in all, including slaves in almost every part of the land, with the Indian tribes still near and powerful, is graphic, bringing before us the wide differences in the people of the different sections, isolated from each other and retaining all the peculiar characteristics of their origin. "Differences of race, differences of nationality, of religious opinions, of manners, of taste, even of speech, were still distinctly marked."

Travel between the cities was slow and difficult; the roads were poor; bridges few; coach and horses, like the pedestrian, were carried over the rivers in flat-boats, and in stormy weather the passage of the Hudson, Delaware, or Potomac was a matter which excited more anxiety in many a household than now would be caused by the gentleman's trip across the Atlantic.

He pictures well the life of the more wealthy in Boston, and the life in the towns and in the farms of New England. We see their food, the reading, the religion, the schoolmaster, the housewife at her labors,

in her visits, her shopping and marketing, and follow her even to the intricacies of her making change.

During colonial days the theatre and shows were comparatively unknown. The British army did much to create a taste for them. With the peace came projects of theatres, and the whole question of the propriety of allowing theatrical and other performances was widely discussed in the papers of the day. The whole discussion, the prosecutions that resulted, the state of public feeling, are graphically given by Mr. McMaster. A Catholic will form some idea of the state of the public mind when he hears that Bishop Carroll had to come out in the papers when an old priest was held up for public condemnation on the charge that he had attended a circus!

The life of a mechanic is thus described. "In the low dingy rooms which he called his home were wanting many articles of adornment and of use now to be found in the dwellings of the poorest of his class. Sand sprinkled on the floor did duty as a carpet. There was no glass on his table, there was no china in his cupboard, there were no prints on his wall. What a stove was he did not know, coal he had never seen, matches he had never heard of. Over a fire of fragments of boxes and barrels, which he lit with the sparks struck from a flint, or with live coals brought from a neighbor's hearth, his wife cooked up a rude meal and served it in pewter dishes. He rarely tasted fresh meat as often as once in a week, and paid for it a much higher price than his posterity. Everything, indeed, which ranked as a staple of life was very costly."

Meats were high, vegetables few and scarce; fruit had not been cultivated scientifically, yet our author seems to carry his ideas on this point too far, for the house of Murray in New York even during the Revolution shipped Newtown pippins to London, where they brought a high price. He makes the tomato a vegetable introduced from France, but it was cultivated almost from the date of the settlement in Florida, and was known throughout the West Indies and along the Gulf of Mexico.

The state of the prisons and of prisoners is a picture that is sad enough; and yet the fall of the royal power swept away many crimes and modified others. Before the Revolution the slightest offence in a church, the theft of a book, a blow, or the like, was a sacrilege, the punishment for which was death.

The chapter devoted to the Weakness of the Confederation gives a graphic picture of our General Government before the Constitution was adopted, and of all the projects which led to the call of a convention. Trade and commerce declined, a general spirit of disaffection prevailed, which at last ended in defiance of authority.

The whole history of the Convention which formed the Constitution has never been presented in a form more likely to be read and understood than in this volume, which carries the reader back to the period, with all its needs and aspirations. How the Constitution was received by the people of the several States is a point on which most are profoundly ignorant. As presented here it will create astonishment. Delaware was the first State to ratify the new Constitution, December 6th, 1787, but by the middle of the following April only five others had followed this course, Massachusetts being the last and setting the example of proposing amendments which she deemed essential. Then other States accepted it, each proposing amendments, till New York, which had been awaiting the action of Virginia, finally adopted it in July, when the requisite ten had already accepted. The amendment to the Constitution which prohibits Congress from establishing a religion was proposed by New Hampshire, and its object, undoubtedly, was to save these

United States from ever having Catholicity established by law. There has been a kind of dream-like idea prevalent among Catholics that this amendment emanated from Bishop Carroll, and was the result of a petition of the Catholics addressed to or through General Washington. It is clearly only a confusion based on the address sent to Washington after his election as President.

We find the amendment clearly marked out in the acceptance of the Constitution by New Hampshire, while in the proceedings of the first Congress there is no trace whatever of any Catholic petition or any action which gives the slightest indication that any such petition ever existed. The amendments proposed by the several States were matters that came necessarily before Congress for action, and the adoption of that proposed by New Hampshire was accepted readily. It is certain, too, that any amendment to the Constitution proposed then or at any time since by Catholics as such, would be summarily rejected.

We are then carried back to the first Presidential election, and to the intrigues against Adams; to the inauguration of Washington, to the formation of the new government, which few trusted, but which was to raise the country to new life.

A Federal Congress took the place of the old Continental Congress, with a President and Cabinet. New questions arose, one, that of slavery and the slave trade, not to be finally settled except by a terrible war.

The present volume brings us to the period when the new government was completely organized and seriously at work. If the succeeding volumes show the same skill, this history will undoubtedly be more widely read than any of our histories of the United States.

There is nothing in this volume as to the position of Catholics during the period it embraces, yet there was scope for a picture. Emerging from the penal laws, they could leave in Maryland the old chapel built by legal enactment under the same roof as the priest's house, and erect churches like other denominations. They began to form congregations from Boston to Georgia; the clergy had long and anxious deliberations, dreading to excite public odium if they asked the Holy See to appoint; feeling the necessity of being delivered from all spiritual dependence on England, fearful of having some French-Irish priest forced on them by Stuart influence, till, at last, the clear common sense of Benjamin Franklin cut the knot when the Nuncio at Paris called upon him for his views, and American Catholics obtained a bishop,—the patriotic John Carroll, who was already prefect apostolic.

Our author, alluding to what he imagines was the progress of liberality in ideas, says: "Compared with Cotton or Hooker, a New England minister of 1784 had indeed made vast strides towards toleration. He was a very different man from the fanatics who burned Catholics at the stake, who drove out the Quakers, who sent Roger Williams to find an asylum," etc.; but, to do New England justice, she never burned Catholics at the stake. Our martyrology has no such page. Plymouth had her penal laws against Catholics, and so had Massachusetts, passing a stringent one in 1700, but the spirit which prompted them was the same that fixed a price on the head of Father Rale; the same that has, to this day, disfranchised Catholics in New Hampshire; the same that in 1800 placed the amiable and charitable Cheverus in the dock as a criminal; the same that, thirty years later, applied the torch to the convent in Charlestown, and to churches in New Hampshire; the same that tarred and feathered Father Rale; the same that refused a charter to a Catholic College; that justified the punishment of a Catholic boy fer refusing to say a spurious form of the Lord's Prayer; that appointed

Convent-spying committees; that constantly allows perpetrators of outrages on Catholics, even the murderer of a priest, to go unpunished. No; the advance in liberality has not been as great as some would suppose. The John Jay who, in the New York Constitutional Convention of 1776, moved to add to the section on religious toleration the words: "Except the professors of the religion of the Church of Rome, who ought not to hold lands in, or be admitted to a participation of the civil rights enjoyed by the members of this State," lives a century after in the John Jay of our days, who strings a column of sophistries to justify the system by which Catholic inmates of public institutions are prevented from enjoying the worship of their own church, and are forced to join in a Protestant service, drawn up by Protestants, from Protestant standards, and conducted by Protestants. In that family, at least, bigotry blinds the grandson as completely as it did the grandfather.

An Introduction to the Study of English Literature and Literary Criticism. Designed for the use of Schools, Seminaries, Colleges, and Universities. By *Professor James Baldwin*. Volume I—Poetry; Volume II—Prose. Philadelphia: John E. Potter & Co.

A more pretentious and at the same time trashy work on the subjects it professedly embraces we have seldom met with. In his excursions through the fields of literature the compiler (for there is scarcely anything really original in it) seems to have used a hay-rake or a drag-rope to gather his materials, and then, finding that the quantity collected was too great for him to manage, to have thrown a part away and to have used the other part, weeds, brambles, grass, and ripened grain, as they come to hand, without discrimination, and, seemingly, without possessing the faculty of discrimination.

In every department of his work he has associated together as of approximate merit writers of genius or eminent talents with others of mediocre or inferior ability. A large number of distinguished authors are passed over without mention, while many whose worthless productions, and even their names, have passed into merited oblivion are brought prominently to view. The highest degree of critical discrimination the author of this work seems capable of is to attach adjectives—such as "able," "great," "high," "sublime"—to the names of the writers he mentions, and, to give a specimen of his nice use of language, he says of one writer that he gave "sublime vent" to his thoughts. Whatever of real criticism the work contains consists of quotations from other writers, and the value of these is marred and made almost useless by the fact that there is no congruity or system in their selection and arrangement—the only idea seemingly guiding their compiler being to select the most sensational quotations he could find.

To review these volumes systematically and point out their faults and numerous errors, both of commission and of omission, and the evidences in which they abound of an utter want of good judgment, and taste, and discrimination, would require more space than it is worth while to give them. We mention a few instances just as they meet our eye. In the chapter on "Theology and Religion" the only American writers mentioned are Cotton Mather, Jonathan Edwards, William Ellery Channing, Theodore Parker, Henry Ward Beecher, and T. De Witt Talmadge. What do our Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist, and Methodist friends say to this? The entire criticisms of the last-mentioned four are as follows: Of Channing (quoted at that), that "He has the love of wisdom and the wisdom of love;" of Theodore

Parker that, "In the writings of Theodore Parker he (the reader) will discover many passages of high literary merit;" of Beecher and Talmadge that, "In the sermons of Henry Ward Beecher and T. De Witt Talmadge he (the reader) may peruse some of the finest examples of modern pulpit oratory." The author or compiler of these volumes seems to have never heard of such American Catholic pulpit orators as England, Lynch (each in his time Bishop of Charleston), and of Ryan, Coadjutor Bishop of St. Louis, whose eloquence has enraptured and entranced thousands of non-Catholics as well as Catholics, nor of many distinguished American Catholic pulpit orators and writers on religion, a few of whose names, as they recur to us while writing, we mention without regard to order of time or of ability and learning, such as Kenrick, Hughes, Spalding, Bayley, Hill, Hecker, Hewitt, Stone, Preston, Orestes A. Brownson, J. G. Shea (the latter eminent especially for his invaluable contributions to the history of North America, and particularly to its religious history), and a host of others.

Turning back in this same chapter—"Theology and Religion"—we are able to find the names of only two Catholic writers in England, Scotland, and Ireland, except a bare mention of "Bede's translation of St. John's Gospel." First, that of Sir Thomas More, who is disposed of as follows: "Sir Thomas More, better and more favorably known as the author of the *Utopia*, was the opponent and bitter foe of Tyndale. Seven volumes of controversial letters, containing the most virulent denunciations, were written by the great chancellor, and remain to add nothing to his honor. In these letters abuse takes the place of argument." Then follows a quotation of eight lines in illustration of this last statement. From Sir Thomas More we pass on through page after page of bombastic eulogiums of "able" and "ablest," "great" and "greatest" Protestant writers, without encountering the name of a single Catholic until we reach that of John Henry Newman, with whose writings the compiler of the volumes before us evidently has scant, if any, personal knowledge. He quotes from them, but, there is good reason to believe, at second hand. Of other Catholic writers in Great Britain and Ireland he seems to have not even the slightest knowledge, to have never heard of the existence even in Ireland, as well as in England (we mention them just as they occur and without regard to order of time or of merit), of Doyle, Dixon, Murray, McHale, the two Leaheys, Woodlock, Russel, Milner, Bishop Butler and Alban Butler, Robert Manning, Ullathorne, the three Vaughans, Marshall (author of the most exhaustive *History of Missions* ever published), Dalgairns, Faber, Oakeley, Bagshawe, Coleridge, Cardinal Manning, and Cardinal Wiseman, the latter of whom was as distinguished for his literary, philological, and scientific attainments as for his theological learning, and who at the time of his death was preparing, at the request of a number of distinguished non-Catholic Englishmen, to deliver in London a series of lectures on Shakespeare.

Following up this subject of omission of the names of Catholic writers, we turn to the volume on Poetry, and look in vain there for the names of Aubrey de Vere, Faber, and Newman, all of whom have attained just distinction in England, and the sacred poetry and hymns of the two last-mentioned are admired and cherished by High Churchmen and Ritualists, as well as by Catholics. We might suppose that, perhaps, the cause of this omission is the opinion, which the compiler of these volumes clearly entertains, that there is scarcely room in religion for true poetry. "A single thought (quoting Taine) is expressed a thousand different times; it is only in the manner that we find variety. Some-

times this expression is truly poetical, but often it is no more than a vehement repetition of words, with, perhaps, only those mechanical qualities of poetry—rhyme and metre." Were the compiler of these volumes acquainted with Catholic sacred poetry, even as presented in non-Catholic collections and translations into English of ancient and modern hymns, and had he any appreciation of true poetry, such a sentiment as we have quoted would have found no expression in his book. As it is, the names, and the only names, he mentions of English writers of sacred poetry are George Herbert, Giles Fletcher, Milton, Watts, Pope, Wesley, Byron, Milman, and Keble.

It would occupy too much space and time to go through this volume on English poetry. We simply remark, as specimens of the absence of any true criticism, that we have looked in vain through the volume for any recognition of Byron's real poetic genius, and of the manner in which he misused and abused his high gifts. Shelley and Swinburne seem to be favorites, and receive unmeasured praise. Of the former, we are told, the student of English poetry cannot form any just conception of Shelley's great works through the reading of mere selections; he should turn to them, and study them thoroughly "in their entirety." As to Swinburne, he quotes a number of extravagant encomiums of his writings, without one word of reference or disapproval of the erotic pruriency and obscenity which disgrace them. While no mention, or a mere mention, is made in the volume of many poets of real merit, a large number of mere rhymsters are named as "poets," and quotations made from their writings.

Turning again to the volume on English prose, we find in the chapters entitled "Essays," "Politics and Political Economy," "Oratory," "Philosophy and Science," omissions of any mention of some of the most distinguished writers. And the "critical" remarks about those that are mentioned consist of quotations from other writers, selected, seemingly, on the principle of choosing the most highly eulogistic and sensational.

In the chapter entitled "The Transition Period," we find the following and only mention of St. Thomas Aquinas: "Thomas Aquinas, the Benedictine Monk, was, like Duns Scotus, an ardent Realist. But the two men differed in their views regarding foreordination and free-will." . . . "Thomas Aquinas devotes three hundred and fifty-eight chapters (!) to discussing the nature of angels." Then, what purposes to be a short quotation, and the compiler says: "Such was the stuff with which the learned men of the Middle Ages seriously occupied their time and their talents. Now and then, as if by accident, a schoolman would originate a happy thought, a valuable idea."

With one more remark we dismiss these volumes of indiscriminate literary padding. They are put forth as text-books, "unsectarian" text-books. What kind of "unsectarianism" pervades them will appear from the two following extracts, taken respectively from the concluding chapters on "Theology and Religion," and "Philosophy and Science:"

"When Christianity arose, eighteen centuries ago, it was in the East, in the land of the Essenes and Therapeutists, amid universal dection and despair, when the only deliverance seemed a renunciation of the world, an abandonment of civil life, destruction of the natural instincts, and a daily waiting for the Kingdom of God. When it rose again, three centuries ago, it was in the West, amongst laborious and half-free peoples, amidst universal restoration and invention, etc. . . . No wonder if the New Protestantism differs from the ancient Christianity, if it en-

joins action instead of preaching asceticism, if it authorizes comforts in place of prescribing mortification, etc. . . . A vast revolution has taken place, during the last three centuries, in human intelligence. . . . We know that positive discoveries go on day by day. . . . From this body of invading truths springs in addition an original conception of the good and the useful, and, moreover, a new idea of Church and State, art and industry, philosophy and religion.[1]

"'The effect of Mr. Darwin's work,' says Professor Fiske, 'has been to remodel the theological conceptions of the origin and destiny of man, which were current in former times. . . . Again has man been rudely unseated from his imaginary throne in the centre of the universe, but only that he may learn to see in the universe and in human life a richer and deeper meaning than he had before suspected. Truly, he, who unfolds to us the way in which God works through the world of phenomena, may well be called the best of religious teachers.'" . . .

SOCRATES. A Translation of the Apology, Crito, and Parts of the Phædo of Plato. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1883.

It is to be desired that persons who are unfamiliar with the language of ancient Greece would read and carefully study this volume containing Plato's statements of the ideas entertained by a heathen philosopher, who of all heathen thinkers before or since approached most closely to the doctrines of divine revelation on some of the most important subjects that can challenge the attention of mankind. The reasonings of Socrates as given by Plato are valuable to believers in divine revelation, as showing how an acute, profound, and earnest mind, four centuries before the nativity of our Lord and Redeemer, honestly employing the unaided light of reason, and faithfully following it, exposed and refuted the fallacies of the skeptics of his time. Materialists and radical revolutionists—the former of whom disbelieve and deny the existence and immortality of the soul, and the existence of a Divine Providence, and the latter of whom wage persistent war against divinely constituted authority in Church and in State—would discover, if they seriously and honestly studied the arguments of Socrates, that they are totally in error, and that natural reason, as well as Divine Revelations, disproves their errors, and also shows that they are wholly and purely pernicious in their consequences.

The volume before us contains a new translation of those parts of Plato which are essential to an understanding of the personal character and the moral position of Socrates, and includes one of the most famous of Plato's own speculations on the immortality of the soul and its existence after death. The Apology shows, among other things, the sturdy independence of Socrates, the inflexible resolution with which he executed what he believed to be a divine command, and the calm fearlessness with which he announced to his judges that he should obey God rather than man. The Crito gives us an opposite but no less striking view of the character of Socrates, showing the real respect for the laws and institutions of his country which he felt under all his defiant independence. It contains the eloquent argument in which he refuses to evade and consult the authorities of the State, by escaping through flight from the execution of even an unjust sentence. Thus these two discourses exhibit Socrates as equally firm in upholding the supremacy of duty above all human power, and in recognizing the supremacy of law

[1] Adopted by the compiler from Taine.

above all personal considerations, and even above life itself. The principles and reasoning of this ancient heathen put to shame the fallacies and delusions of adherents in this age to two opposite yet kindred errors, for they both have a common origin—the upholders of the supremacy of the State over the human conscience on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the deniers of any real divinely originated authority of the State over individuals.

In the Phædo we have the narrative, by Plato, of the closing scene in the life of Socrates, with the conversation on the soul and its immortality which Plato represents him as holding with his friends during the last few hours before he drank the hemlock. Of this dialogue the narrative part is given in full, while many of the discussions are abridged by omitting parts of the argument, which the translator thinks have lost their interest for the present age, or are too abstruse. Where these omissions occur abstracts of the omitted portions are given by the translator.

In passing from the Apology to the philosophical discussions of the Phædo, the reader cannot fail to notice the great change in the more dogmatic tone which Socrates is made to assume in the latter. The reason of this is easily understood, when we consider that in the former we have the real, actual Socrates, and in the latter the Platonic Socrates. For Plato was, had the habit, in his dialogues, of frequently using his master as a mouth-piece for the expression of his own speculations, and he thus makes Socrates utter many doctrines which the real Socrates had probably not thought of, and many, too, which, rigid questioner that he was, he certainly would have subjected to a merciless cross-examination. Among these is Plato's doctrine of independent ideal forms, which, we know, from Aristotle, was never developed by Socrates himself. Yet we find this doctrine expounded in great detail by Plato's Socrates in the Phædo, and made the basis for an elaborate argument for the immortality of the soul. Still we must remember that it is through Plato that his master is best known, and that it is the Platonic Socrates quite as much as the real Socrates who has passed into history.

It is in the Apology that we find the real, genuine Socrates, the plain, honest, unpretending inquirer, whose portrait has been drawn from another point of view by Xenophon, in his Memorabilia; the keen, rigid analyzer, whose searching questions stung to madness the sophists and people of Athens, as they saw their cherished fallacies and delusions brushed away like cobwebs by the searching questions of Socrates. For Socrates never professed to be a teacher in the ordinary sense of the word; he called himself an *examiner*. The result of these tormenting examinations of the opinions and ideas of all classes of persons in Athens was a general enmity against him. For the great enemy of truth in Athens was not ignorance, pure and simple, but ignorance puffed up with the conceit of knowledge, and it was against this that Socrates spent the best part of his life in combating.

The parallelism between this condition of Athens and the present age seems to us too obvious to require dwelling on. The spirit of shallow skepticism, the same superficial conceited dogmatism, the same fondness for and eager taking up of novel theories, the same dislike to rigid, searching examination and testing of favorite opinions, the same aversion to severe thought, the same unwillingness to recognize the difference between hastily adopted notions and true knowledge. Hence we regard the work before us as calculated, if carefully read and studied, to render valuable service, in exposing and refuting the fallacies of the prevailing skepticism and materialism of our own age.

THE LETTERS AND MEMORIALS OF WILLIAM, CARDINAL ALLEN (1532–1594). Edited by Fathers of the Congregation of the London Oratory. With an Historical Introduction, by *Thomas Francis Knox, D.D.*, Priest of the same Congregation. London: David Nutt. 1882.

It has been long and deeply felt by those who look beneath the surface of events that a life of Cardinal Allen would be a very important acquisition to the history of England during the reign of Elizabeth. Yet the difficulties in the way of successfully accomplishing such a work seemed insuperable. The loss of manuscript and printed documents which existed nowhere but in the English establishments on the continent of Europe, and which were destroyed by the revolutionists of France, and the jealous exclusion from public or private inspection of letters and documents which were preserved in absolute secrecy in the State archives of England, seemed to render it impossible to obtain materials sufficient to obtain a correct insight into the real relation which the Cardinal held to historical movements of England, France, and Spain, during the period referred to. This difficulty has been lessened, if not removed, by several recent occurrences. Although the wholesale destruction of Catholic documents on the continent and in England during the wars and revolutions which followed the so-called Reformation, is an irreparable misfortune, and an injury to historical studies to an extent which it is impossible to exaggerate, yet many valuable papers have survived the wreck, some of which have been recently brought to light, and still others of which may be discovered, if carefully sought for, in England and on the Continent. Moreover, the increased interest taken in the study of historical sources has led to the publication of catalogues and abstracts of many manuscript documents, hitherto unknown or inaccessible, and also to the removal or lessening of the restrictions by which the contents of State archives were jealously kept from inspection and examination. Hence it has now at length become possible to gather together and publish a large number of documents which throw a clearer light upon many subjects and events in the history of England during the reign of the Tudors, the contents and present existence indeed of many of which have, until now, been unknown.

The Fathers of the Oratory, and of the Society of Jesus in England, have zealously and industriously engaged in the work of searching for and examining these documents, and bringing their heretofore hidden contents to light.

In undertaking and performing this task they have rendered invaluable assistance to present and future writers of history, have thrown a clear light upon many facts and events whose causes, connections, and relations were very obscure, and have cleared away many misapprehensions, and exposed many wilful perversions and misrepresentations of the actions of prominent Catholics, both laymen and ecclesiastics, and of the Sovereign Pontiffs of the Church, in that period, which hitherto, from want of documentary evidence, it was impossible to freely refute.

The volume before us, by Father Knox, of the English Oratory, is a very valuable contribution to this important work. It consists of two hundred and eighty-four letters and documents of Cardinal Allen, or letters and documents relating immediately to him and to his official acts, two hundred and twenty-five of which are now printed for the first time, three have been in part printed before, and the remaining fifty-six have been previously printed. Besides these documents the footnotes contain important explanations and elucidations of the text of documents, taken from unedited MSS. or rare books. The chief sources from which the MS. documents have been derived are the archives of the See of

Westminster, the English State papers, the Roman transcripts in the Public Record Office, London, the Spanish archives at Simancas, the British Museum, the archives of the Kingdom of Belgium at Brussels, the archives of the English College at Rome, the archives at Stonyhurst College, and the MS. collections belonging to the old Brotherhood of the English Clergy, formerly known as the English Chapter. The documents are in English, Latin, Spanish, Italian, and French. Many, however, of those in Italian and most of those in Spanish have been translated into English, and many, too, of these and of other documents throwing light upon them have been substantially incorporated into an Historical Introduction to the Collection, which, of itself, is of great value. The whole work makes up a volume of upwards of five hundred quarto pages.

Father Knox brought to the execution of his task peculiar and rare qualifications, and devoted to it all his spare time for five years. He died from heart disease while the last sheets were passing through the press. The author of the Preface to the work, a Father of the London Oratory, from whom we gather these latter facts, intimates that valuable materials exist for "future volumes of these Records," and says that but two things are necessary to turn them to account, "first, competent laborers, and, secondly, sufficient interest on the part of the public in this kind of publications to secure their labors from pecuniary loss." We sincerely trust that both these conditions for the prosecution of the important undertaking of the volume before us is a part which will not be wanting.

Of the value of Father Knox's work there can be but one opinion on the part of those who know the intimate relation, the Cardinal, for many years sustained to the Holy Roman See, the Courts of France and Spain, and to the Catholics of England, and who are acquainted with the complex movements and relations of different European countries to each other, and of England to them all during that period.

In addition to many other subjects which the volume elucidates, it incidentally throws a clear light upon the charges of treasonable practices and of complicity with plots to assassinate Elizabeth, brought by Hume and other English historians against the Catholics of England, and particularly against the Catholic priests in England, the Holy Roman See, and Mary, Queen of Scotland, and furnishes strong proofs of the falsity of those charges.

LIFE OF ST. DOMINIC. By the *Rev. Père H. D. Lacordaire*, of the Order of St. Dominic, and Member of the French Academy. Translated by Mrs. Edward Haseland. London: Burns & Oates. 1883.

A life of St. Dominic by Lacordaire, it would naturally be expected, would be interesting. The charm of the distinguished writer and preacher's style, and his intense attachment and devotion to St. Dominic, would secure this to anything he wrote, respecting that eminently great saint. As a mere narrative or biography, therefore, the work before us possesses high merit, but its clams to consideration go far beyond this.

Among all the great saints of the Church there is, probably, no other with whose name and memory so much and so bitter prejudice, on the part of non-Catholics, is associated; none other, whose life, actions, and character have been so entirely misunderstood, and so thoroughly and so persistently misrepresented. And this misapprehension and misrepresentation have attached to the glorious Order which St.

Dominic founded, and in which his spirit still lives and works. The members of the Society of Jesus are hated and feared, are calumniated as animated and guided by a spirit of diabolical subtlety and deceit, derived by direct inspiration from the "Father of Lies." To counteract the silent but powerful influence which their virtues, their learning, their obedience, and their labors in promotion of science, literature, and religion, is constantly exerting, a system of misrepresentation is maintained against them, subtle, cunning, shrewd, and deceitful, akin to the very diabolical spirit which they are falsely charged with possessing. But the Dominicans occupy a different position in the eyes of the world, and are subjected to a different form of misrepresentation and of opposition. The members of the Society of Jesus and the members of the Society of St. Dominic are both hated alike; yet, they are very differently regarded. The former are popularly looked upon by the non-Catholic world as semi-demons, possessing superhuman diabolical power, and, as such, are dreaded and feared. The latter are regarded rather as savage beasts in human form, possessed of human intellects, but animated by the passions and nature which cause ferocious beasts to delight in rending and tearing to pieces their prey.

Thus, it has been accepted as a historical truism by non-Catholics that St. Dominic and his followers slaughtered the Albigenses without mercy, preached a crusade of extermination against them, and burned hundreds of thousands of Jews, Moors, and heretics, in Spain. It is taken for granted, too, that this savage spirit of merciless persecution still lives in the Order of St. Dominic, and only wants the power and opportunity to exert itself effectively now in nameless deeds of cruelty, as it is alleged it did in past ages.

Nothing could be more untrue than this, yet nothing is more currently believed. Hence, a work, such as the one before us, exhibiting in true light the life, the character, and the deeds of St. Dominic, and the real spirit, nature, and object of the Order he founded, is calculated to perform an important service to the truth, in removing prejudices and mistaken opinions from the minds of candid non-Catholics, and in exhibiting to Catholics the eminent virtues and apostolic spirit of one who rendered such illustrious services to the cause of true religion.

There are two important topics among the many comprised in the work, in the treatment of which the author has been specially happy. One of these is the fact that St. Dominic is in no way responsible for the war waged, that was made upon the Albigenses, nor in any way connected or complicated with its occurrences. The justice, the necessity, of that war can easily be shown; but, just and necessary, or not, it and its concomitants and incidents constituted a movement entirely separate from, and independent of, the mission of St. Dominic. Each of them stand upon their own special ground, and each was instituted and carried forward without reference to the other. This important fact the author of the work before us shows and proves with great clearness and force.

The other point, to which we referred, is the peculiar constitution and rule of the Order of St. Dominic, and the causes which produced them! St. Dominic aimed at founding an Apostolic order,—an order or apostolate of preachers. The needs of the Church and character of the age required this. Yet, there were serious difficulties in the way. The Fourth Lateran Council had decreed that, to avoid confusion and inconvenience resulting from the multiplication of religious orders, no new ones should be created. Moreover, preaching being an office transmitted by the Apostles to the Bishops, it seemed contrary to an-

tiquity and sacred tradition that it should be exercised by any other than the Episcopal order. True, Bishops might appoint competent Priests to preach in their stead. But, still, it was one thing for each individual Bishop to provide for religious instruction in his Diocese by appointments revocable at will, and another, and a very different thing, to confide to a particular order the perpetual and universal function of preaching.

How these difficulties were overcome, and the influence they had upon the peculiar rule and constitution of the Order of St. Dominic, and how the Order was thus, in the Providence of God, made to take the exact form and character best adapted to the fulfilment of its important mission, is clearly brought to view by the author.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF ANSELM, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, AND PRIMATE OF THE BRITAINS. By *Martin Rule, M.A.* In 2 vols. London: Kegan Paul, French & Co. 1883.

A life of St. Anselm, we mean not simply a personal biography or portraiture of his personal character, but a narrative which exhibits him in his relations to the age in which he lived and labored, thought, wrote, and heroically fought for the rights and liberties of the Church, is a work of primary importance in itself, and has, too, a special and practical relation to questions of our own present time; for, the questions which confronted St. Anselm and consumed the greater part of his life, are precisely those which, under somewhat different form, yet identical in principle, are most fiercely fought over to-day. The efforts in European countries, and in those of Central and South America, to subordinate the Church to the State, and make the former simply an ecclesiastical bureau of the latter, and the settled policy in this country that in all questions of social morality, and questions which are concerned with both spiritual and temporal interests, the State shall have supreme jurisdiction, have their root and ground in the same principles that were involved in the conflict which St. Anselm was compelled, against his wishes, but constrained by duty, to carry on, first, with William Rufus, and then with Henry II., of England. And so, too, the same metaphysical and philosophical questions referring to the existence of God, and the proofs of His existence, which St. Anselm pondered over and elucidated, are the same that enter into the metaphysical and philosophical conflicts of our own time.

St. Anselm, we were going to say, was a "many-sided" man. He was not. According to natural tastes, predilections, and gifts, he was a student and thinker. According to his desires, sanctified by divine grace, and which desires, for a time, he was permitted to gratify, he was a simple monk, of an ascetic order, in a rigidly-ruled monastery, devoted to vigils, penance, self-mortification, and study. But very soon God, in his providence, broke in upon St. Anselm's dearly-loved quietness of life, by causing him to be burdened with the distracting cares and responsibilities of administrator and prior, and soon afterwards, abbot of the monastery in which he preferred to be an obscure and humble brother. And then, as if to crown his disappointment and try to the utmost his submission to the Divine will, he who had always striven to be obscure, who wished to know nothing of the world, and to be unknown by it, who desired nothing beyond and outside of a monastic life, was forced and compelled, despite his tears, remonstrances, and protestations, to leave his loved monastery, and monastic companions, to give up his seclusion, and accept the perillous and difficult functions

of Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of England, during one of the most disturbed and confused periods of England's history.

Under all these aspects as monk, student, archbishop, and primate, and, when that office involved the most complex relations and functions, bringing its incumbent into constant connection and collision with the fierce, imperious, and semi-savage successors of William of Normandy, the life of St. Anselm must be studied in order to be really understood. And to thus understanding it, too, the age in which he lived, and the processes of transition and formation through which its peoples and countries were passing, with the confusions and conflicts thus necessarily arising, must also be reproduced in thought and feeling.

This is the task which any one who essays a true life of St. Anselm must undertake. To the performance of this work the writer of the volumes before us devoted many years of laborious research and faithful study, "reading over and over again the inestimable but almost unexplored mine of St. Anselm's correspondence, collating Oderic, William of Malmesbury, and Eadmer's 'Vita St. Anselmi,' and his 'Historiâ Novorum,' gathering from 'all sorts of odds and ends of eleventh and twelfth century literature,'" whatever might throw light upon his subject, visiting the place of St. Anselm's birth, and other places made memorable by association with his presence, labors, and conflicts. After having thus collected materials, the writer spent other years in sifting, arranging, and digesting them, and as the result we have a delightful narrative in which St. Anselm, his companions, and co-laborers, and those with whom he was compelled to contend, and the age of which he and they formed a part, seem to be revived and to again become real.

THE WORKS OF ORESTES A. BROWNSON. Collected and Arranged by *Henry F. Brownson*. Volume II. Containing the Second Part of the Philosophical Writings. Detroit: Thorndike Nourse, Publisher. 1883.

The questions discussed in this second volume of Dr. Brownson's writings, are even more profoundly important than those which were comprised in the first volume. In their treatment, Dr. Brownson displays the characteristics, which we spoke of in our first notice, as distinguishing his writings generally—transparent lucidity of style, searching analysis, keenness in perceiving and making distinctions, directness and closeness in argumentation, and perfect fairness and honesty in stating and meeting objections.

The volume contains nineteen articles on the deepest and most far-reaching questions that can claim human consideration. The first article is an "Essay in Refutation of Atheism," which occupies ninety-four pages, and under fifteen distinct heads; searchingly examines and with masterly ability refutes the various fallacies put forward by atheists as a basis for their unbelief. He also examines with keen discrimination the various methods and processes of argument, by which believers in God undertake to prove His existence, and points out how far they are sound, and where they fall short. In the course of this masterly and profoundly-learned essay, the leading ideas and arguments of almost every distinguished thinker and school of philosophy are stated and discussed, from the time of Plato and Aristotle to the present. Apart even from the positive ideas on the main subject of his essay put forth by Dr. Brownson, and as merely a searching philosophic examination of numerous systems of philosophy, ancient, mediæval, and modern,

this paper is an exceedingly valuable contribution to Christian metaphysical literature.

The importance of the other articles comprised in the volume may be inferred from their titles. There are four articles on Vincenzo Gioberti, acutely and profoundly examining his leading ideas and their practical influence: first, his general system; secondly, his "Philosophy of Revelation," third, his "Philosophy of Religion," and fourth, "The Giobertian Philosophy," as a system. Then comes an invaluable article on "The Philosophy of the Supernatural." This followed by an article, which under the title of "An Old Quarrel," gives a history of the conflict, so long waged, and still carrried on under different names and changes in the form of the controversy, between the Nominalists, Realists, and Conceptualists. After this follow articles respectively entitled, "Victor Cousin and his Philosophy," "The Church Review and Victor Cousin," "The Cartesian Doubt," "Porter's Human Intellect" (two articles), "Christianity and Positivism," "Professor Bascom's Lectures" (on Science, Philosophy, and Religion), "Balmes's Philosophy," "Ontologism and Psychologism," "Father Hill's Philosophy" (two articles), "The Eclectic Philosophy."

In addition to the value of the two volumes thus far published of the collected writings of Dr. Brownson as comprising Dr. Brownson's own profound speculations and ideas, they are remarkable for the immense knowledge they display of the positions and ideas of almost every prominent metaphysical writer, ancient or modern. Without any such intention on the author's part, they really, though incidentally, serve the purpose of a "Hand-book of Philosophy," in which, with far keener determination, analysis, and clearness of statement than characterize the vast majority of such books, the leading ideas of almost every prominent thinker and writer on philosophy are discussed and reviewed.

THE CHRISTIAN FATHER; WHAT HE SHOULD BE, AND WHAT HE SHOULD DO. Together with a Collection of Prayers Suitable to his Condition. From the German of Rev. W. Cramer. By *Rev. L. A. Lambert*, Pastor of St. Mary's Church, Waterloo, N. Y. With an Introduction by Right Rev. Stephen V. Ryan, D.D., C.M., Bishop of Buffalo. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers, Printers to the Apostolic See. 1883.

The companion volume of this work, *The Christian Mother*, by the same author, has deservedly met with much favor, and we doubt not that "the Christian Father will obtain, as it merits, an equally favorable reception. It is characterized throughout by practical good sense, simplicity and deeply religious lessons. It is not an ideal of a father that is depicted in its pages, but an actual, genuine Christian father, such as God intended fathers to be, and such as may and can be found at the head of Christian families, faithfully discharging their duties to society according to his circumstances and position, and sanctifying himself in the ordinary every-day duties of life."

As we have already intimated, the work is thoroughly practical. The author first draws a life-like portrait of what a Christian father should be and may be; shows the sublimity of his position, its duties and obligations, the difficulties and dangers to which he is exposed, the graces he needs for the sanctification of himself and his household, and the means he must employ in order to secure those needed graces. He shows that, as God has stamped upon all men the image of His divine nature, so also He has decreed that His fatherhood should have its image in human

fathers; that as to Him so also to them should children owe their being; and that as He created His children in His natural and supernatural likeness, so also should fathers communicate to their children a part of their material and spiritual nature. He shows, too, that as there is "no power but from God and those that are ordained of God," so human fathers are images and representatives of our Divine Father in heaven; that they stand above their children, their rule by divine appointment, exercising and bound to exercise authority over them, and responsible to God for the manner in which they exercise that authority.

These truths form the foundation on which the author builds, the premises from which he draws his practical conclusions. How practical they are may be inferred from a few examples of the subjects discussed. Under the general counsel to "avoid dangers," the author points out "the dangers to faith," in associating with unbelievers, in reading books and taking periodicals and papers written by unbelieving and immoral men, which misrepresent and ridicule the Church and her teachings, and in leading a sensual, idle, or careless life, in visiting public houses and places of worldly amusement, in negligence and irregularity in attending to religious duties.

In like practical manner the author points out the manner in which the Christian father should qualify and fit himself for properly governing and training his children, and explains their duties under the titles, among others, of "Government," "Discipline," "Law, Rule, and Order," "The Enforcement of Rules," "Punishment," "Superintendence of Children," etc. Among the last subjects which he treats of is that of the evils of "Mixed Marriages."

The work is published with the *Imprimatur* of His Eminence John Cardinal McCloskey, Archbishop of New York, and is also warmly commended in an introductory chapter by the Right Reverend Bishop of Buffalo.

ST. FRANCIS'S MANUAL FOR MEMBERS OF THE THIRD ORDER. Arranged by a Father of the Order of St. Francis. Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati.

As its title indicates this work has been prepared for the special use of Tertiaries of St. Francis. It is intended to be a manual in the fullest sense of the word, containing a very large number of prayers and devotions for guiding the Tertiaries in their religious exercises, and giving them instructions and directions for sanctifying their daily life.

It is divided into two parts. The first comprises prayers and devotions common to all Christians, and especially suitable for persons who are striving after Christian perfection. A number of these prayers have been taken from the writings of St. Gertrude, St. Matilda, St. Alphonsus Liguori, St. Leonard of Port Maurice, etc., and a number also of indulgenced prayers from the "Raccolta."

The second part contains instructions, devotions, etc., specially intended for Tertiaries; the Rule and Explanations, Ceremonies at Reception, Profession, etc. This part also of the work may be used with great advantage by all Christians, on account of the practical and suggestive and edifying character of the instructions and lessons it contains.

Use has been made in various parts of the work of a number of other prayer-books, such as: *The Vade-Mecum; The Sacred Heart of Jesus and Mary; Seraphic Manual; Manual of Perpetual Help; Golden Manual; St. Vincent's Manual*, etc.

The selections from these approved works have evidently been

made with great care and sound discrimination, and have been so arranged and combined as to form a volume which, without being cumbersome, contains devotions suitable for assisting at all the usual and some of the special services of the Church, and also for private devotions at home. The work is published with the *Imprimatur* of His Eminence Cardinal McCloskey, Archbishop of New York.

SANTA TERESA DE JESUS. Estudio Historico-Critico-Biografico Premeado con medalla de Oro en el certamen literario que celebró el Casino Español el dia 16 de Octubro de 1882, en commemoracion del Tercer Centenario de la ilustre Santa, por D. Antonio Lopez Prieto. 8°. 72 pp. Habano. 1882.

Among the tributes to the great Saint Teresa called forth by her Centenary, America has produced nothing more elegant or worthy than the study of the great Cuban scholar, Don Antonio Lopez Prieto. A corresponding member of the Royal Academy of History of Madrid, and member of the Royal Economical Society of Havana, he is known for his untiring collection of material bearing on the history of Cuba and the adjacent parts, as well as for his skilful use of the printed and unpublished treasures with which he is so familiar.

The introduction brings before you the glories of Spain in her time, especially the Christian glories, and the influence the peninsula exercised on religious thought throughout Europe, in reviving religion and checking the progress of error. He then sketches the life of St. Teresa, showing how she contributed to that influence, and from her cloister of poverty became the teacher of the wise and learned. The chapter devoted to her mystical writings is indeed a study; and the work closes with an examination of her poetry. Few of our readers can form any conception of the works written in Spain, even in our day of revolutions, on St. Teresa and her works. Señor Prieto shows familiarity with all, and his work, essentially that of a close and accurate scholar, is imbued with a spirit of faith and allegiance to the Church which makes it heartily enjoyable.

The treatise is exquisitely printed and adorned with a striking photograph from an authentic picture of the Saint.

THE NEWARK CATECHISM. A Simple, Orderly, and Comprehensive Catechism of the Catholic Religion. Approved by the Right Rev. M. A. Corrigan, D.D., Bishop of Newark. American News Company, New York.

This Catechism was written more than three years ago by Rev. M. L. Glennon, of St. Bridget's Church, Jersey City (now Pastor of the Church of the Holy Spirit, Asbury Park, N. J.), and was published with the approval of the Ordinary, Right Rev. Dr. Corrigan. Since then it seems to have grown into such favor that not only has a new edition been called for in New Jersey, but its popularity has extended to other dioceses throughout the country. This is not surprising; for the little book verifies its title, being simple in style, orderly in arrangement, and comprehensive enough for those for whom it was written—the smaller children of parochial schools. Nothing is harder than to write a good Catechism; and the younger the children, the greater becomes the difficulty. Theological accuracy is necessary, of course; but it is not all-sufficient for the purpose, as any one may see from the Catechisms current amongst us. A more indispensable requisite is catechetical experience, and a fixed purpose (that must not be lost sight of for a moment) to say nothing that a child may not readily understand. Rev. Mr.

Glennon has succeeded very happily, we think, in using the plainest and simplest form of words, and therefore the best adapted to the intelligence of tender age. His last chapter on festivals of obligation and their meaning is certainly a great improvement on ordinary Catechisms.

SCIENCE AND SENTIMENT, with other Papers, chiefly Philosophical. By *Noah Porter, D.D., LL.D.* New York: Scribners. 1882.

Although not a very profound or accurate philosopher himself, Professor Porter has a decided taste for philosophical studies, and his excellent judgment saves him from that temptation to "evolve a system," which is the besetting one of philosophers. So far as we have read the writings of Professor Porter, he seems to lean toward the philosophy of Sir William Hamilton, whose works he edited in America, and for whom he certainly entertains profound respect.

The present work is a collection of essays, written chiefly for the *Princeton Review*, and treating of such subjects as "The Science of Nature *versus* The Science of Man;" "What we Mean by Christian Philosophy," etc. There are also criticisms of John Stuart Mill, and the Agnostic philosophers and scientists. Whilst nothing new or striking is presented, the valid arguments for the historical truth of Christianity, the possibility of the mind's attaining truth, and the *loci communes* of philosophy are well brought out, in a vigorous and readable style. Perhaps the most remarkable essay, from a Catholic point of view, is the one entitled "The Collapse of Faith." The admission is made that there seems to be no faith, in the Christian sense, among a very large proportion of Protestants. But this failure of faith is treated only as a "passing eclipse," similar to that of Deism, which once pervaded England, or of Atheism, which once ruled France, but which disappeared as suddenly as it came. To a Catholic mind, familiar with the absolute permanency of the faith, at least as a system of objective truth, the idea of its disappearance, even for the briefest space, seems odd; but the Professor takes such vanishings as a matter of course.

A STUDY OF SPINOSA. By *James Martineau, LL.D., D.D.* London: Macmillan. 1882.

It is but justice to Spinosa to say that he deprecated the evil consequences of his pantheistic system. But these were inevitable. If human actions and passions are only modifications of the Being who is all, sin must certainly be ascribed to God as its author. To evade this conclusion, Spinosa sought to rationalize sin away, and, in his peculiar exposition of the Hebrew Scriptures, he makes sin mainly a phantasm.

Dr. Martineau has gathered all the facts of the life of the philosophic Jew of Amsterdam, who for non-metaphysicians is best known from Auerbach's novel, *Spinosa*. The chief error of his life was his philosophy, as, personally, he appears to have been a quiet, inoffensive, and rather commonplace man. As a philosophy, pantheism has long ceased to have any hold in the schools. Besides, Spinosa's definition of substance as that which is conceived *per se et in se*, and the concept of which does not involve the concept of anything else, is so arbitrary, confused, and inadequate, that it cannot serve for the basis of a rational philosophy. His ascription of thought and extension to the Divinity is a contradiction in terms, and his theories have been overturned a dozen times by all classes of thinkers and all religious controvertists.

The author does not pretend to pass any *critique* upon Pantheism.

He simply sets forth the system as embodied in the writings of Spinosa. Whether the study of a monstrous fiction and dream serves any worthy purpose may well be questioned, though to the student of philosophy such books have their uses.

NATALIE NARISCHKIN, SISTER OF CHARITY OF ST. VINCENT OF PAUL. By *Mrs. Augustus Craven*, author of "A Sister's Story." Translated by Lady Georgiana Fullerton. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers, Printers to the Apostolic See.

This is not a "story," in which the actual labors and experiences are made to furnish materials, which the fancy of the writer has worked up into a "true tale." It is the biography of an actual person, a Russian lady of noble birth, who was attracted to the Catholic Church during her visits to Italy and France, in the company of her relatives. After passing through many trials, she became a convert to the true faith, and subsequently a Sister of Charity.

The scene of her labors, during her life as a Religious, from 1848 to 1874, was Paris, where, as a simple Sister, as Secretary at the Mother-House, and as Superior of the Community of the Rue Saint Guillaume, she led a life of great self-abnegation, faithfulness to her vocation, and sanctity. During the siege of Paris in 1871, and the reign of the Commune, she was indefatigable in her charitable labors, and prosecuted them with undaunted heroism, unmoved by the perils that surrounded her.

The chief incidents and events in Sister Natalie's life, her relations to Russian society, the sacrifices she made, her interior struggles, her faith and devotion, her persevering energy in good works, and her happy death, Mrs. Craven has described in a very interesting manner.

THE SODALIST'S VADE MECUM. A Select Manual of Prayers and Hymns. Composed, Selected, and Arranged by *Edwin F. McGonigle*. Philadelphia. 1883.

The Vade Mecum is really what its name implies, a very useful companion to the sodalist at home, in church, or in choir.

The book is beautifully printed. In the offices the Latin words are carefully marked so as to insure a correct and uniform pronunciation. Such parts of the office as are not generally recited by the sodality have been omitted. The space gained has been filled by the insertion of hymns with appropriate music, harmonized, for the greater part, for four voices. To these are added the psalm tones most in use. Mr. McGonigle has been, for some time past, specially interested in the training of sodalities, and his labors have been crowned with the most complete success, as any one can attest who has ever attended a celebration prepared under his direction.

To those who have awaited the outcome of his work in this direction, the *Vade Mecum*, we are sure, will be most welcome and satisfactory. We hope it will meet with the favor it deserves.

THE BEAUTIES OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH; or Her Festivals and Her Rites and Ceremonies Popularly explained. Translated and adapted from the German of Rev. H. Himioben by *Rev. F. I. Shadler*. With an Introduction, by Right Rev. P. N. Lynch, D.D., Bishop of Charleston, S. C. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet, Printer to the Holy See and the Sacred Congregation of Rites. Fourth Edition. 1883. 8vo., pp. 499.

We are heartily glad that this excellent work has reached a fourth edition. It speaks well for the good taste of both clergy and laity through

the country. It is seldom that we have seen the modern popular objections against the Church, her doctrine, discipline, and ceremonies, so well and clearly stated as in this book, and we must add so well and vigorously refuted. We think the book an invaluable help to a clergyman in stating clearly the belief of the Church, and in removing those objections that are more common in modern times than before. Any priest who has once made use of the book as a help to his preaching, will not fail to use it again. And we do not know that we could give the book a better recommendation. We have conversed on the subject with some of the most intelligent pastors in the country, and all agree that it is exactly the book that meets their wants. Father Shadler, who has translated it into good, idiomatic English, deserves the gratitude of all for having put it within the reach of English readers.

THE CATHOLIC PIONEERS OF AMERICA. By *John O'Kane Murray, M.A., M.D.*, Author of the "Popular History of the Catholic Church in the United States of America," "Prose and Poetry of Ireland," etc. New York: J. P. Kennedy. 1882.

The object of this work is to furnish in one volume biographies of a number of Catholics more or less prominently identified with the history of America, in order to clear their memory from the misrepresentations of non-Catholic writers, and to furnish reliable information respecting their real lives and characters. The biographies are eighty in number, and are brief, as they necessarily must be in order to be comprised in a single volume. They are, however, sufficiently full to furnish a general idea of the actions and characters of the persons whose lives are sketched.

ELIANE. By *Mrs. Augustus Craven.* Translated from the French by Lady Georgiana Fullerton. Boston: Thomas B. Noonan & Co.

A beautifully written and interesting tale, belonging to the *Catholic Leisure Hour Library* series. The scenes of the story are laid in France and Italy; the action turns chiefly on the difference of English and French customs with regard to the betrothal and marriage of young persons. The various characters are well drawn, and the interest of the reader in them is maintained to the end.

ALICE RIORDAN, THE BLIND MAN'S DAUGHTER. A Tale for the Young. By *Mrs. J. Sadlier.* Boston: Thomas J. Noonan & Co.

This is a beautifully bound reprint of an old and interesting, and deservedly popular Catholic story, describing how a little Irish girl landing at Montreal with her blind father was preserved from many dangers by persevering in the practice of her religious duties.

LITTLE HINGES TO GREAT DOORS. And Other Tales. By *F. S. D. Adams*, author of "Marian Howard," etc. New York: The Catholic Publication Society.

This volume contains three beautiful tales that cannot fail to be attractive to young folks, and old ones also, who are fond of reading stories. They are as true, too, in principle as they are interesting in detail.

BOBBIE AND BIRDIE, OR OUR LADY'S PICTURE. A Story for the Little Ones. By *Frances J. M. Kershaw.* Philadelphia: Peter F. Cunningham & Sons.

A very instructive story, full of interesting incidents, which are told in such a manner as will not fail to interest little children.

PERIODICAL 70741

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM